

MARTIANUS CAPELLA & HIS EARLY COMMENTATORS

Thesis submitted by

J.A. WILLES, B.A.

for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in the University of London

**UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE
LONDON**

University College London,
Gower Street,
London, W.C.1.

June 1952

BEST COPY AVAILABLE.

VARIABLE PRINT QUALITY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1.	<u>THE LIFE AND WORK OF MARTIANUS CAPELLA</u>	p.1.
Section 2.	<u>THE INFLUENCE OF MARTIANUS CAPELLA IN THE MIDDLE AGES, ETC.</u>	p.16.
Section 3.	<u>COMMENTARIES NO LONGER EXTANT</u>	
	a. Martin of Laon	p.29.
	b. "M & G"	p.32.
Section 4.	<u>"DUNGHAD"</u>	p.36.
Section 5.	<u>JOHANNES SCOTTUS</u>	
	1. The Manuscripts	p.42.
	2. The Original Form	p.67.
	3. The Present State of the Text	p.72.
	4. The General Character	p.80.
	5. The Sources	p.84.
Section 6.	<u>REMIGIUS</u>	
	1. The Manuscripts	p.105.
	2. The Form and Characteristics	p.125.
	3. The Sources	p.157.
	<u>CONCLUSION</u>	p.180.
	<u>APPENDICES</u>	p.183.

MARTIANUS CAPELLA AND HIS EARLY COMMENTATORS

1. The life and Work of Martianus Capella

The literary fame of Martianus Capella has been far beyond his deserts. Neglected, as it seems, during his life-time, he rose after his death to a position second only to Virgil among pagan authors, until the revolution of ten centuries brought him once more to that oblivion which his merits might justly claim. Since the revival of learning indeed it has been but rarely that a word has been said in his defence. Scriverius spoke of his style as "lippitudo Latinitatis", and declared him quite unfit reading for the young; Nicolas Heinsius stigmatized him as "scriptor operose in multis ineptus": "tota poesis distorta et stribliginibus persita" is the judgment of Caspar Barth on his verses; "aspera, semibarbara et difficilis" are Fabricius' words to describe his prose. Even his editors, whom some kind of literary piety might have roused in his defence, find only that their deeper acquaintance renders him the more odious. Franz Eyssenhardt would not concede that his author should be numbered among the sane: Adolf Dick confesses himself gravely exercised by the difficulty of distinguishing the blunders of copyists from those of the writer.

Yet it was this man who was revered in the early Middle Ages as a great genius, who guided the first steps of the young in the seven liberal arts, and whose style did much to produce that tinsel

elegance, which in the more pretentious mediæval writers is so much more repulsive than the honest barbarity of the lawyers.

I have said that Martian was neglected in his life-time; but in fact the dates of his life are extremely uncertain. The evidence for his dating may be summarized as follows. For external evidence we have one notice in Fulgentius, two in Cassiodorus, a subscription in some of the manuscripts of Martian, and an alleged ancient life. For internal evidence we have references to Carthage and to Rome, use of material from Solinus, Quintilian Aristides and Aquila Romanus, and general stylistic criteria.

Fulgentius in the *Expositio Sermonum Antiquorum* 45 (p.123,4 Helm) says that caelibatus signifies abstinence and virginity, "unde Felix Capella libro de nuptiis Mercurii & Philologiae: Placuit Minervae pellere caelibatum." The passage to which he refers is in the first book, p.6,17 Dick - "constituit (Mercurius) pellere caelibatum". Unfortunately the date of Fulgentius is uncertain. Friebe's identification of him with that Fulgentius who was bishop of Iuspa from 507 to 533, although supported with great industry, involves the assumption that the two periods of literary activity in the life of the compound Fulgentius show differences in style simply because they were directed to different objects. Although naturally a writer may be expected to write in different styles according as he is discoursing on the mysteries of the Incarnation or the amours of Jove,

it is too much to believe that the author of the Mythologiae and the Virgiliana Continentia could ever have written rationally about anything. But even if the identification had been proved, we should not be much better informed about our author's dates, since it may be shown that his work was in circulation in 535 at the latest, a bare two years after the death of Fulgentius of Puspae.

In his Institutiones Cassiodorus twice refers to Martian, whom he designates, as does Fulgentius, as Felix Capella. In the first of these passages (ed. Mynors p.109,1) Martian is mentioned as having written a work entitled De Septem Disciplinis - "Felix etiam Capella operi suo de Septem disciplinis titulum dedit". In the second (p.130,11) he is again said to have written on the disciplines (that is to say the seven liberal arts) in a compendious manner suitable for beginners - "Audivimus etiam Felicem Capellam aliqua de disciplinis scripsisse deflorata, ne talibus litteris fratrum simplicitas linqueretur ignara". Nevertheless Cassiodorus has not seen the book with his own eyes - "quae tamen ad manus nostras adhuc minime pervenire potuerunt".

These passages are not found in the edition of Garetius, upon which the world perforce had to rely before 1937. According to Mynors, who has produced the only critical edition of the Institutiones, the two references to Martian are found in the authentic text as written by Cassiodorus, but are omitted in the first and second interpolated versions. The interpolated versions however incorporate

material taken almost word for word from Martian (see Hynora' introduction p.xxvii). The date of composition of the Institutiones is about 550 of the Christian era. Thus these two references do not contribute vitally towards fixing the date of Martian, although they bear gratifying testimony to the intellectual honesty of Cassiodorus, who was previously thought to have rifled Martian without acknowledgment.

In addition to these references there is what seems to be a "ghost" reference. I first met this in the latest edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica, which says that Cassiodorus calls him (i.e. Martianus Capella) "Madaurensis". No reference to the works of Cassiodorus is given. The same remark is found at the end of Remigius' commentary on Book IX in Migne PL 130, without a reference. Ernesti's edition of Fabricius' Bibliotheca Latina tells the same tale, which is taken over from the original edition. The source for all these passages seems to be the edition of Grotius, where likewise no reference is given. In the more modern works of reference (e.g. Schanz-Hosius-Krüger IV,2, sec. 1084) I find no mention of this alleged reference in Cassiodorus. It seems therefore that the onus of supplying the reference is upon those who believe in it. It is hardly necessary to point out that, if Cassiodorus did in fact speak of Martian as Madaurensis, he was merely confusing him for the moment with Apuleius, as a pair of African philosophers and Latinists of the most fantastical type.

In five of the manuscripts of Martian there appears a subscription at the end of Book I to this general effect: "I, Securus Melior Felix the rhetorician, vir spectabilis, with the help of my pupil Deuterius (al. Eucherius), emended this work from most corrupt manuscripts at the Porta Capena at Rome on the fifth of March in the consulate of Paulinus." Securus Memor (or Melior) Felix took part in the Mavortian recension of Horace in 527. Since he describes himself as "vir spectabilis" in this subscription, his consulate having been in 527, it seems likely that the consulate of Paulinus here referred to is that of 535, not 498. Since we must assume that the text had been in circulation for some considerable time in order that only corrupt copies should be obtainable, it is reasonable to assume that Martian wrote before 500.

In Fabricius' Bibliotheca Latina, as revised by Ernesti, the following note is found (tom.3, p.215):- "Vitam Marciani ineditam e Ms. vetustissimo reperimus in Barthii Advers. L. CIX c.13 adhuc inedito." This part of the Adversaria still remains unpublished, and I have been unable to find where the manuscript of any part is preserved. The only hint as to the contents of this ancient life is given by an anonymous reviewer in the Jenaer Literaturzeitung for 1794, p.350, quoted by Eyssenhardt (praef. p. IX), who in reviewing the Onomasticon Litterarium of Saxius, claims to know "aus einer andern zuverlässigen Quelle" that Martian was therein assigned to the period of the Gordians. The clue is exceedingly tenuous, and the manuscript to which it leads may well have been another forgery by

the ingenious Barth, as Nyssenhardt suggests. In any case, the date is far too early to be credible in view of the internal evidence, which may be considered next.

It is generally agreed that among the authors used by Martian are to be reckoned Solinus, Aquila Romanus and Quintilian Aristides. Of these the first is commonly reckoned to have written between 200 and 250, the second about the same time, and the third can hardly be earlier than 250. So far there is no serious conflict in our evidence but there is still a gap of 250 years between the earliest and the latest possible date of Martian. To reach a more precise estimate we must consider more closely the evidence to be drawn from historical references in the text itself.

On p.534,13 D Martian speaks of himself as living at Carthage (*beata alumnus urbs Elissae quem videt*). Three lines earlier he speaks of the dignity of proconsul (*proconsulare culmen*). In another passage (333,5) he speaks of the present prosperity of Carthage (*Carthago inclita pridem armis, nunc felicitate reverenda*). It follows that he wrote his work before the sack of Carthage by Gaiseric in 439. At the time of writing he was advanced in years (4,6 *respersum capillis albicantibus verticem incrementisque lustralibus decuriatum*; 533,11 *senilis fabula*). His date of birth then cannot be earlier than 390. Two other references raise very great difficulties. On p.325,12 Martian speaks of the Golden Horn as "*pro-suntorium Ceras Chryseon Byzantio oppido celebratum*". As

Eysenhardt remarks, this passage would be "in sano homine satis certum aetatis indicium". There are two possibilities: either Martian wrote before 330, or he is not a "sanus homo". The latter assumption is necessary to make it credible that he copied this passage from his source (Solinus 10,17), and was too stupid to make any correction. That our author was capable of such folly is only too probable, since his errors in the books of the quadrivium have long been the object of unsparing condemnation by scholars from Meibomius to Mommsen. The value of this passage as a biographical datum may therefore justly be doubted. In another passage (311,11) Martian speaks of Rome - "Roma armis viris sacrisque quamdiu viguit caeliferis afundibus conferenda". This is an amplification of a passage from Pliny N.H. III 38, where Rome is simply described as "terrarum caput". Here we have a different situation. Martian does not copy out his source without alteration: he makes an addition of his own. Now although by sheer inadvertency or ignorance a writer may make an error of omission by failing to bring his source up to date, it must be assumed that if he deliberately alters what he found in the source, he must have some reason for doing so. In the passage of Pliny Rome is described as the capital of the world: Martian says that she deserved the highest praise "quamdiu viguit". Now if Rome had ceased to flourish, such an interpolation is quite understandable, and we can confidently translate quamdiu viguit by "as long as she flourished". We are then led to believe that our

author wrote after the sack of Rome in 410. In the alternative we must believe (with Dick and Wessmer) that quandiu viguit means "all the time that she has been flourishing". To this view there are two objections. In the first place it involves very dubious Latinity, since one would expect in that signification quandiu vixit. In the second place it makes the addition entirely motiveless. If Rome was still flourishing, she was still capital of the world; and if she was still capital of the world there was no reason to alter Pliny's wording. In other words, if Martian wrote these words while Rome was still the mistress of the world, he was not merely "non sanus homo", but omnium insanientium insanissimus. We thus have a period of twenty-nine years within which we may assign the composition of the work of Martianus Capella. This view was held by Schanz-Hosius-Krüger (section 1084), but has been abandoned by P. Wessmer in the article MARTIANUS in Pauly-Wissowa, whose arguments against the fifth-century dating are principally these. Firstly the passage about Rome is of no importance, since it is copied from Pliny. Secondly the versification is too good for the fifth century. Thirdly Martian shows an acquaintance with Juvenal which suggests that he wrote in the middle of the fourth century.

With the first point I have already dealt . As regards the versification, I am able to see little in it that deserves high praise. Elaborate attempts are made to defend him by Sundermeyer (De Re Metrica et Rhythmica M.C., Marburg 1910), but even this most

determined apologist is compelled to admit the existence of such blunders as *āculeus* and *axiōma*, and to excuse the numerous faults of the final poem by assuming that the author was far advanced in senile decay when he reached this part of the work. The contagion of Martian's versifying seems even to have affected his defenders, since Sundermeyer, while attempting to palliate *Tēllūs*, has the misfortune himself to perpetrate *ēdīdīcīt* (p.6). But even if Martian's verse is, as Stange remarks (*De Re Metrica M.C.* p.38), better than that of his "contemporaries", this is no certain proof of date, since skill in Latin verse is a quality very liable to variation from one man to another, and there is no reason why a man possessing a good knowledge of the classical poets, as Martian obviously did, should not have achieved a relatively high level of metrical skill. The argument from the knowledge of Juvenal is one which requires syllogistic form to do it justice. It runs on these lines:-

"Ammianus Marcellinus (XXVIII,4 14) says that some of his contemporaries would read nothing but Juvenal and Marinus Maximus. Martianus Capella shews signs of acquaintance with Juvenal. Therefore Martianus Capella was a contemporary of Ammianus Marcellinus." The facts are sound enough, and their discovery does credit to Mr. Wessner's learning: but the argument is naught.

It seems reasonable then to assign the literary activity of Martian to the period between 410 and 439. The details of his life cannot be filled in. He makes it clear that he was a lawyer (*cura*

districtior forensis rabulationis p.287,19), and it seems likely from some corrupt words in the final poem (proconsulari vero dantem culmini(p.534,10) where Kopp proposed to read perorantem and Sundermeyer verba dantes), that he had pled cases before the proconsul of Africa.

The work of Martianus Capella is one of the most singular products of literary fancy. The god Mercury is represented as deciding to take a wife, with which end in view he considers in turn the most suitable objects of his affections. He passionately desires Sophia, but she is determined to remain a virgin. Of equal beauty is Mantice, the elder daughter of Pronoea, but alas, she has become the bride of Apollo. The gifts of the gods have been lavished on Psyche, but Mercury sighs in vain, for she is promised to Cupid. Virtus now counsels him to seek the advice of Apollo, and the two go in search of him. He commands to the notice of Mercury the maiden Philogia, who is noted as well for the depth as for the variety of her learning; and upon Mercury's embracing the suggestion with alacrity, the three, Mercury, Apollo and Virtus, rise through the celestial spheres to solicit the favour of Jupiter for the proposed

nuptials. When the divine consent has been won, preparations are made for the apotheosis of Philologia and for her union with Mercury. All the gods of high and low degree are invited to the wedding, with the exception of Discordia and Seditio, the life-long enemies of Philologia. After mature consideration it is decided that Fraus should be bidden to the ceremony. Meanwhile Philologia herself with maidenly modesty has felt some apprehension concerning the high honour thus to be conferred upon her, but she is won over when the nine Muses, who have been sent to summon her, address her in turn in strains appropriate to their several characters and in nine different metres. Thus escorted Philologia rises through the celestial spheres, each presided over by its proper divinity, until she arrives in heaven, where she finds herself in a company of gods, heroes and philosophers. Here are Linus, Homer and Virgil, Orpheus and Aristoxenus with sounding lyre, Plato and Archimedes roll golden globes, Democritus is wrapped in a cloud of atoms, Heraclitus burns, Thales drips, Epicurus brings roses and violets, Aristotle pursues in heaven, as he did on earth, the elusive maiden Entelechia. To solemnize the occasion, seven of Mercury's household have been invited to attend - Grammatica, Dialectica, Rhetorica, Arithmetica, Geometria, Astronomia and Harmonia - and these in turn come forward to expound their mysteries. Each is distinguished by some peculiarity of dress or deportment: Grammatica has a file for smoothing out

asperities in pronunciation, Dialectica is of small and compact build, and serpents hiss in her hair, Arithmetica appears to be counting with incredible speed upon her fingers, and Astronomia comes rolling into the assembly enclosed in a golden globe.

Such is the economy of the piece. In style it resembles nothing more than Tertullian attempting to write in the style of Apuleius. The words most favoured are lengthy compounds - vernificus, suaviloquus, divinatric, coniecturalis, perennitas, honoratio, affectatio, diversicolor, smaragdineus, and their like, while the sentence structure, although often simple in itself, bends under the weight of cumbrous periphrases expressing by means of several abstract nouns what might have been conveyed by one suitable adjective. Although there is so obvious an effort to avoid monotony by a search for unusual and difficult expressions, many of the turns of phrase sicken by their perpetual repetition. His latest editor judges him thus: "I do not hesitate to call Martian the most careless of all African writers. In him there is no attention to the true signification of words, a boldness in the use of metaphor and in the invention of new words which exceeds all bounds, a most perverse imitation of Greek idiom, a thoughtless confounding of prosaic and poetical language, nothing normal or natural, but everything tumid and artificial." (A. Dick, De Martiano Capella emendando, pars II, 1889, p.3)

The preposterous thread of narrative is told for the most part in the greatest seriousness, and the mythological setting is borne in mind from beginning to end. There are a few scattered attempts at humour, in which our author is as much at home as a cat in water, but otherwise there is nothing to break the monotony, except the frequent passages of verse.

We already have seen the adverse judgment of Barth upon the verses of Martian. Modern scholars, particularly Stange and Sundermeyer, have been more lenient, and indeed it is impossible to refuse him the title of an ingenious metrician. He must also be allowed to have possessed some slight tincture of poetic feeling, which makes his verses less painful to read than his prose. He is occasionally capable of grace and prettiness, as in 79,20:-

Transcursa, lector, parte magna fabula,
 quas tam morosis implicata ductibus,
 tenui lucernam palpitare lumine
 coegit instans immitens crepusculum,
 et ni rosetis purpuraret culmina
 Aurora primo et convenustans halitu
 surgens fenestras dissecaret lumine

or 48,20:-

Et iam tunc roseo subtexere sidera poplo
 coeperat ambrosium promens Aurora pudorem,

cum creperum lux alma micat, gemmata Dione
 cum nitet, aurato vel cum fit Phosphoros astro.
 tunc candens tenero glaciatur rore pruina
 et matutina greges quatiunt in pascua caulas.....

although even here the ear is shocked by matutina, which
 Grotius vainly strove to emend by transferring et to the end
 of the preceding line.

Occasionally his verse can rise to a semblance of dignity,
 as in the hymn to the sun in 73,10:-

Ignoti vis celsa patria vel prima propago,
 fomes sensificus, mentis fons, lucis origo,
 regnum naturae, decus atque assertio divum,
 mundanusque oculus, fulgor splendentis Olympi,
 ultramundum cui fas est cernere patrem
 et magnum spectare deum; cui circulus aethrae
 paret, et immensis moderaris raptibus orbis....

But on the whole Martian's verses are written "majore cura quam ingenio", and with little enough of either.

Of the sources of Martian's work I propose to say nothing.
 The subject has been frequently touched upon in monographs
 (Krahmer, De Varrone ex Martiani Capellae satyra supplendo;
 Lücke, De Mart. Capellae Libro Sexto; more recently Beiers,
 Detlefsen, Thulin and Weinstock have dealt with individual
 problems), and Martian is an author whose future is more important

than his past. But some gratitude at least is due to a man who played his part, however small, in keeping alive the name and some part of the learning of Varro in the Middle Ages.

2. The Influence of Martian in the Middle Ages up to the Times of Johannes Scottus

The first writer to shew traces of the influence of Martian is the first who mentions him, Fabius Planciades Fulgentius the mythographer. This writer is one of the outstanding figures of the early Middle Ages. His intellect is beneath contempt, his learning ill-digested and in large part imaginary, and his style vicious and depraved. He has been arraigned with cruel Italian rhetoric by Comparetti, and damned in brief Latin epigram by Barth. But in these languages a high degree of emphasis is generally permitted. A rarer distinction has come the way of Fulgentius. He is, so far as my knowledge extends, the only writer of whom the unemotional Martin Schanz has remarked that it is a torment of Hell to read him (eine wahre Höllempeln). The debt of Fulgentius to Martian was noticed by Thomas Muncker, whose learned notes on the Latin mythographers make his edition still indispensable, and to him I owe some of the following citations of parallel passages, which shew how deeply the diction and style of Martian had influenced the later writer.

Fulgentius p. 3. 16 Helm

Parumper ergo ausculata dum tibi rugosam sulcis anilibus
ordiar fabulam, quam nuper Attica saporante salsa, nocturna
praesule lucerna commentatus sum

Martian p.4.17 Dick

Fabellam tibi, quam Satura comminiscens hiemali pervigilio
marcescentes mecum lucernas edocuit, ni prolixitas per per-
culerit, explicabo.

Compare also Mart. 533,11 - habes senilem, Martiane, fabulam /

miscilla lusit quam lucernis flamine / Satura ...

Fulgentius p.6.8 Halm - intercapedinante pavoris prolixitate

Martian p.490.6 - intercapedinatae prolixitatis

Fulgentius p.8.6 - Gorgonei fontis adspargine madidas et
praepetis ungulas rivo merulentas Pierides abstraxit.

Martian p.50.17 - cui Magnesia poculum fluente et fons
Gorgonei tulit caballi. id.10.4 praepetis omina pennae.

Fulgentius 8.22 - Tum illa; Una, inquit, sum e virginali
Eliconiadum curia ... quam olim Athenaeam civem Romanus
ordo colendam exceperat.

Martian p.154.22 - possem femina doricae nationis apud
Romuleae vocis examina ... satis barbara reperiri. quippe
post Platonis aureumflumen atque Aristotelicam facultatem
Marci Terentii prima me in latinam vocem pellexit industria.
(The theme of the translatio studii is repeated in the case
of Dialectica.)

Fulgentius p.9.23 - cassata inquisitione

Martian p.43.4 - non cassa opinatione

Fulgentius p.13.21 - marcentia ... Immina

Martian p.4.18 - marcescentes ... lucernas

Fulgentius p.15.4 - Carneadis resudat elleborum

Martian p.151.10 - Carneadesque parem vim gerat elleboro.

Fulgentius p.85.19 - Nam non illa in tuis operibus quaerimus,
in quibus aut Pitagoras modulos aut Eraclitus ignes aut
Plato ideas aut Ermes astra aut Crisippus numeros aut endelecias
Aristoteles invertebat ...

Martian p.78.14 - ardebat Heraclitus, undus Thales, circumfusus
atomis Democritus videbatur. Samius Pythagoras caelestes
quosdam numeros replicabat, Aristoteles per caeli quoque
culmina Entelechiam scrupulosius requirebat ...

c.f. id. p.151.5 - Sed licet ipse modos demum bis quinque
profatus / pallens afflictim verberet Aristoteles ...

Fulgentius p.86.7 - Putabam, inquit, vel te, homuncule,
creperum aliquid desipere

Martian p.4.13 - 'Ne tu' inquam 'desipis admodumque perspicui
operis ἐγέρισμον noscens creperum sapis?'

Fulgentius p.85.2 - Chrisippi elleberi rancidulo acreore post-
posito

Martian p.151.8 - Chrysippus cumulet proprium et consumat
acervum / Carneadesque parem vim gerat elleboro ...

In the form of his works also Fulgentius shows himself
to be under the same influence, since he adopts for his exposition

of Virgil an allegorical setting less elaborate indeed, but just as absurd as that of his model. But the later writer has not even the distorted literary gifts of Martian, for he cannot keep his machinery going even for the short space of the Virgiliana Continentia without making the shade of Virgil say something only appropriate to Fulgentius himself (p.98,23 Helm - Tricerberi fabulam iam superius exposuimus: the reference is to Mythol. p.20,9!) Nevertheless, despite the profound admiration which he seems to have had for Martian, Fulgentius was characteristically incapable of making a correct quotation from him, for in the passage of the Sermones Antiqui which has been cited earlier, he makes the absurd mistake of quoting "placuit Minervae pellerere caelibatum", when in fact it was Mercury who had formed that laudable design.

So much then for Fulgentius. His great contemporary Boethius was less affected by the De Nuptiis Philologiae. Fabricius (Bibliotheca Latina III,17) speaks of the satire-form as "scribendi genus quod postea longe feliciter imitatus est Boethius", and there the similarity between the two writers ends. I can find no indication in Boethius that he had ever read Martian, beyond perhaps glancing cursorily at the general layout of the work. The comparatively pure diction of Boethius contrasts greatly with the strained elegance of Martian, and although both were animated by a zeal for the arts, their methods are entirely different. There is one striking indication that the De Nuptiis was unknown to Boethius,

which has not, I think, been noticed before. In the De Musica I, 26 Boethius speaks of the names of the notes - hypate, mese, etc. - which have been rendered into Latin by Albinus as principalis, media, etc. Boethius speaks of this as of a rather striking innovation. Now since Martianus Capella employs the same nomenclature in his ninth book (p. 495 seq.) it seems either that Boethius was unaware of Martian's usage or that he suppressed his name deliberately. The first alternative is obviously preferable.

Cassiodorus, as we have seen, had heard of the work of Martianus Capella, but had not (at least at the time when he was writing the Institutiones) personally handled a copy of it. At the same time that he has brought to light this fact, Mynors has purged the text of Cassiodorus from those accretions which were thought to shew the use of Martian as a source for the Institutiones. Thus from the latter work we are only entitled to infer the limited circulation around 550 A.D. of the De Nuptiis Philologiae.

The next writer to refer to Martian is Gregory of Tours. At the end of the tenth book of the *Historia Francorum* he begs his successors religiously to preserve his book, no matter how grave its literary imperfections - "Quod si te, sacerdos Dei quicumque es, Martiannus noster septem disciplinis erudit, id est si te in grammaticis docuit legere, in dialecticis altercationum propositiones advertere, in rhetoricis genera metrorum agnoscere, in geometricis terrarum linearumque mensuras colligere, in harmonicis sonorum

modulationes suavium accentuum carminibus concrepare: si in his omnibus ita fueris exercitatus ut tibi stilus noster sit rusticus, nec sic quoque deprecor ut avellas quod scripsi". The authenticity of the passage has been called in question, but it is satisfactorily defended by Arndt, and seems entirely in keeping with the style of Gregory, who warns his readers at the outset that he is not "apprime eruditus". Dick has discovered another indication that Gregory was not unfamiliar with the more elementary parts of the work, in that he declares by way of shewing his rusticity that he "shuns not the clash of mytacism" - non mytacismi collisionem fugio - which seems to imply some recollection of Martian's definition - Mytacismus est, cum verborum coniunctio M litterae assiduitate colliditur" (254,1 Dick) Thus Dick in his list of "testimonia": but by an unhappy chance he has confounded two Gregories. It is Gregory the Great (ep. I,357) who shuns not mytacism's clash, and who exempts the Holy Ghost from the rules of Donatus. Thus we may surmise some knowledge of Martian in Rome towards the end of the sixth century. It will be noted that Gregory of Tours is the first writer to refer to Martian as "Martianus", the name under which he was best known in the later Middle Ages.

The recension of Securus Melior Felix had taken place about five years before Gregory of Tours was born, and perhaps ten or fifteen years before Cassiodorus wrote the Institutiones. Perhaps this recension contributed to the wider spread of the work, since we

find it by the beginning of the seventh century not only in southern Gaul, but in Spain and Ireland.

In the Origines or Etymologiae of Isidore of Seville, the citation of authorities is governed by one inflexible principle, that the immediate source for any statement must be concealed at all costs. Thus it comes about that the names of Varro, Lucilius, Naevius and Nigidius constantly recur, while those of Servius, Gellius and Cassiodorus, whom he is pillaging, are kept in the background. It would be idle therefore to expect the name of Martianus Capella to appear in the Origines; in fact if it did occur, one would be justified in suspecting that Isidore had never read him: but material taken from him without acknowledgment occurs often enough.

Martian p. 164.1 - AEQUIVOCUM est, quando multarum rerum unum est nomen, sed non eadem definitio, ut leo. nam quantum ad nomen pertinet, verus et pictus et caelestis leo dicitur, quantum ad definitionem, aliter verus definitur, aliter pictus, aliter caelestis.

Isidore. Origines II. 26.2 - Aequivoca sunt quando multarum rerum nomen unum est, sed non eadem definitio, ut leo. Nam quantum ad nomen pertinet et verus et pictus et caelestis leo dicitur; quantum ad definitionem pertinet, aliter verus definitur, aliter pictus, aliter caelestis.

The same word-for-word copying takes place in the definition of UNIVOCUM (Mart. p.164,6; Isidore, Orig. II, 26,3). Martian's account of "antiphrasis" (p.165,13-16) has been slightly modified to suit Isidore's manner of definition (Orig. I, 27,34), but the examples (lucus, Parcae) are the same. Isidore adds Eumenides and Manes, which he may have thought of for himself or taken from some other source. The account of the categories as given in Martian p.167,9 ff. is probably the basis of Isidore's more compressed account in Orig. II, 26,6-10, while the enumeration of the figures and moods of the syllogism as given in Martian pp.199-201 closely parallel that given by Isidore (Origines II, 28). The rearrangement however is rather more than one would expect in Isidore, which leads us to suspect that Pseudo-Apuleius, whose he cites as an authority, is here being followed, although of course at second hand through Cassiodorus (see p.118,20 Mynors). From this source also comes the treatment of topics in Origines II, 30, which Dick cites as a parallel passage to Martian p. 236,23- 245,22. Closer to the text of Martian is Isidore's passage on the names of the planets (Orig. II, 71,20-21), which he takes from p.448,10-14, adding some conventional Christian reprobation of pagan folly and wickedness. Also borrowed directly, as it seems, is 525,17 ff. and 528,16 ff. on the names of metrical feet, which appears little altered in Origines I, 17,2-19.

In Spain then we may infer the existence of manuscripts of Martianus Capella in the first half of the seventh century. At about the same time he must have been known in Ireland or Britain, since the Latinity of the Hisperica Famina shows strong affinities with that of Martian. This singular work, which yet awaits its translator, reads like a brutal parody of Martian's tortuous prose style, and provides, if such a fancy be permissible, a fourth and final step towards complete unintelligibility, the preceding stages being Apuleius, Martianus Capella, Fulgentius. It was left to the nameless Irishman or southern Briton to draw their work to its logical conclusion by destroying the last vestige of pretence that language is a means of communicating thought. But to return to detail. The classical work on the subject is that of Zimmer (Nemius Vindicatus p.330 ff.), whose conclusions are that the author, a man quite unversed in classical literature, and thus deprived of any model which might form his taste or enlighten his judgment, followed wholeheartedly the injunctions of Martian for writing in an elevated style. Martian (p. 251, 14 D) gives as examples of new and praiseworthy formations floreus and albicare: the author of the Hisperica Famina breaks out into a rash of adjectives in -eus (including 14 new formations) and verbs in -icare (stemicare, caerimonicare, frangoricare etc). Martian takes Cicero's grandiferas possessiones as a striking example of poetically heightened diction; the result in the Hisperica Famina is a rich crop of compounds in -fer

(lignifer, carnifer, even mortifer signifying mortalis). The alternative to inventing new words is to use "aliena", according to Martian (p. 251,4 D): the anonymous author so interprets this as to use senna for dans, gibra for homo, gona for oculus etc., while Hebrew and Greek words make their appearance variously corrupted. Zimmer's explanation is consistent and ingenious, and throws a great deal of light not only upon the *Hisperica Famina* itself, but also upon the entire literary back-ground of the period.

In Bede there is but slight evidence of the use of Martianus Capella. The grotesque exuberance of his style and the over-fanciful setting of his work could have little in common with the almost classical Latinity and the serene balance of the Northumbrian monk. Yet some traces have been discerned by Manitius, as in the statement of the nature of the world (*de Natura Rerum* III) - "*Mundus est universitas omnis quae constat ex caelo et terra, quattuor elementis in speciem orbis absoluti globata*"; which seems to have been influenced by Martian's briefer definition - "*Mundus igitur ex quattuor elementis isdemque totis in sphaerae modum globatur*" (p. 430,12 Dick). A few scattered similarities between the material contained in Bede's De Arte Metrica and Martian's third book have been noticed by Dick (p.106,108,110,111,113), but nothing like systematic use has been demonstrated. All that may reasonably be inferred is the existence of a manuscript of Martian in Northumbria at the beginning of the eight century.

For the next century there is no indisputable proof of Martian's continuing to be read, but his fate even so was one shared by many writers in the general decline of letters before the Carolingian revival. Dom Cappuyns (Jean Scot Erigene p.79 and note) draws attention to the absence of any mention of him in the early Carolingian period - "A l'époque de Jean Scot, les Mutiae Philologiae et Mercurii, quelque étrange que cela puisse paraître, étaient d'un usage fort rare dans l'enseignement des arts libéraux ... On en trouve à peine quelque traces sous les deux premières générations carolingiennes." Nevertheless it seems to me unlikely that Johannes Scottus picked Martianus Capella out of complete obscurity. The commentary of "Dunshad" seems to be older than that of John, or if it is not, they must both derive material from a common older source, as Manitius thinks (Geschichte etc. I, p.336-7). But a more striking indication that Martian was still read in the first half of the ninth century is found in the poems of Walahfrid Strabo. The poem entitled ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΝ ΑΡΧΟΝ ΤΩΝ ΑΓΑΘΩΝ, no. 50 in Dümmler's edition, has many reminiscences of Martianus Capella, in a way which seems to imply that the allusion will be understood by the reader as well as the writer. A pupil is addressing his master in terms of the warmest reverence and affection, and declares that he needs the aid of all the nine muses to sing his master's praises. Unhappily they have flown heavenward with Phoebus, as the story relates -

Quae, testante mytho, volitantes alite multo

Auricomo comites intomiere polia.

For the poet's use there remains only one, Thalia, whose swan was a sluggard and unwilling to carry her -

Usibus una meis tantum restabat in arvis,

Quam vexit cygnus tardus ad istud opus.

The allusion is clear only to anyone who has read the first book of Martian, where we find (p.20 Dick) that all the Muses fly upwards singing to heaven on their swans with the sole exception of Thalia - "sola vero, quod vector eius cygnus impatiens oneris atque etiam subvolandi alumna stagna petierat, Thalia derelicta in ipso florentis campi ubere residebat." There are several verbal reminiscences of Martianus Capella, all of which Dümmler has noted, which are additional proof, if any were needed, of the poet's familiarity with our author. The second half of the poem consists of a speech in honour of the recipient of the poem, put into the mouth of Thalia, and conveys enigmatically the name of this person. I am quite unable to unravel the riddle, and if Dümmler has been able to do so, he has been sufficiently inhumane to withhold the answer from his readers. The representing of the letters by numbers and the mention of their allegorical significance remind one strongly of the subtle examination made by Philologia of her name and Mercury's in the second book of Martian. Unhappily the poem of Walahfrid's has been thought spurious by W. Grimm, upon the rather

captious ground that it is in leonine verse. On this ground most of Walahfrid's output would incur suspicion. Dümmler nevertheless seems to feel that there is some weight in the view, and draws attention to the general character of the poem as being one written from a pupil to a master. It is easy to suggest that we have here a poem addressed to Walahfrid by one of his pupils; but if that were so, we should be in a strong position for unravelling the riddle of the second section. Since however neither Greek nor Latin numerals seem to yield anything like Walahfrid or Strabo from the information given, it is perhaps best to restrain our scepticism and believe that the poem is genuine. Exact dating of the poem is impossible, but a man is more likely to write flattering epistles to his masters in early than in later life. If this train of inference be legitimate, then we have an indication of a knowledge of Martian around 800 or 810.

But we have now reached the period of the principal commentaries on Martian, and it is to them that we should now turn our eyes.

3. Commentaries no longer Extant

a. The Supposed Commentary of Martin of Laon

That Martin of Laon (ob. 875) wrote a commentary or at least a number of glosses upon Martian, has been argued by Professor Laistner in two able papers (Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 7 (1923) p.421-456; ib. 9 (1925) p.130-138). His case may be summarized as follows. In the manuscripts Vat. Reg. 215, B.M. Royal 15 A XVI, B.N. lat. 4883, Ripoll 74 (at Barcelona) and Barlow 35 (the Bodleian Library) is found a collection of Greek glosses (printed by Goetz in vol. V of the C.G.L. from the first-named manuscript), which are known to be notes of lectures given by Martin at Laon. Among these glosses are to be found several explanations of Greek words found in Martian, who is mentioned once by name. These explanations often shew a considerable resemblance to those of Johannes Scottus and Remigius. Nevertheless the differences are sometimes so great as to make it impossible that Martin should have been excerpting from Johannes Scottus or "Dunchad". (It is of course most unlikely that Remigius' commentary on Martian was written while Martin was still alive.) It seems likely then that Martin either drew upon some older commentary, or that he himself expounded Martianus Capella, and that only his explanations of Greek words were preserved in this collection of lecture-notes.

The theory is attractive, but seems to go rather beyond evidence. The following objections may justly be made. Firstly the case for the borrowing of material from Martin or his source is overstated, since the parallels drawn by Professor Laistner are not always just, and the subject matter of the glosses could in many cases have been taken from the standard textbooks of the day. Thus Martin's note of hymen (BJRL 9 p.131) gives nothing that cannot be derived from Servius on Aeneid IV,99 and Isidore (Origines IX, 7,22). The etymology of Callionea (p.132) comes from Fulgentius (Myth. I,15 (p.27,3 Helm)), and may have picked up a hint from Donatus on Terence's Andria, Prol. 3. The note on gymna, gymnasium and gymnosophistae (p.132) adds nothing to Isidore, Origines, XV, 2,30; VIII, 6,17, and Liber Glossarum GI 25 (Lindsay, Gloss. Lat. I, p.267). The derivation of pirata from $\pi\upsilon\rho$ (p.133) is taken from Isidore, Origines X, 220. The etymology of ichthyophagi (p. 134) may well be a guess from Isidore's account in Origines IX, 2,131. As regards the parallelism between the glosses of Martin and those of Johannes Scottus, "Duncho" and Remigius, there is but an imperfect similarity in the case of the glosses on hymen, Callionea and piratae, and none at all in the case of pandilowata and ghoreaula (p.133).

Secondly it may be doubted whether there is any necessity to assume that Martin's glosses are taken from a complete

commentary upon Martians Capella. The "Scholica Glossarum" gives the impression of a would-be Greek scholar hunting among diverse authors for material upon which to test or display his powers of interpretation. Thus explanations are attempted of Greek medical terms, of expressions in the scriptures and liturgy of the church, and even of the Greek poems of Johannes Scottus. If this was indeed Martin's purpose, there is no reason to suppose that he concerned himself with anything more in Martians Capella than his Greek words or expressions. The other suggestion, that Martin may have taken his material from an earlier commentary now no longer extant, has little to recommend it, and merely adds one more element of theory to the literary history of a period which is already overburdened with speculation.

Thus the evidence from the "Scholica Glossarum Graecarum" can only be taken as shewing that in the middle of the ninth century Martin of Laon expounded to his students the meaning of various terms in Martians Capella which were derived from the Greek. That he wrote a full commentary on Martian is a view which lacks evidence, and which would probably have been abandoned or never suggested, had it not derived support from Manitius' interpretation of a singular feature in the Paris manuscript B.N. lat. 12960, to which we may now turn.

b. The Supposed Commentaries of "M" and "G"

In this history of Medieval Latin literature (I, p.514) Manitius, after speaking of "Dunchad" and Johannes Scottus as sources for Remigius' commentary on Martian, goes on to infer from the presence in the ninth-century manuscript B.N. 12960 of initial letters M and G, that other commentaries also were used. "In addition" says he "Remigius made use of other collections of scholia which served this purpose, since in the unhappily incomplete manuscript Paris 12960, probably the oldest surviving text of his work, there appear at the head of many glosses of considerable length the letters M and G. These letters appear before passages which do not go back to Dunchad or Johannes Scottus. It appears therefore very unlikely that these two Irish commentaries are the oldest of all, since it is highly probable that Remigius indicated by his M and G certain definite predecessors." To this subject Manitius returns in Neues Archiv 36 (1910) p. 55 where he suggests that M may stand for Martin of Leon. Professor Laistner does not oppose the suggestion, and adds it to his evidence from the "Scholia Glossarum Græcorum" in order to shew the likelihood of Martin's having written a commentary upon the "De Nuptiis Philologiae". Manitius' position nevertheless seems to me untenable.

In the first place M and G are not placed before long notes only, but indifferently before long and short. On f.39b29 one finds "M. Decens: eligans, pulcher atque formose." There follows another M and another lemma. On 40a27 is found "M. Egerimion, i.e. resurrectionum vel ascensionum sive mutationum." There follows a G and a further note. Secondly G and M do not always appear before notes which are not derived from John or "Dunchad". On 39b5 there is an M followed by five lemma words and a long note on the four elements, giving the substance of John's note on the same passage (ed. Lutz p.4,3-26). On 40a18 an M is followed by the lemma "decuriatum lustralibus incrementis" and a gloss identical in import with that of John (ed. Lutz p.5, 8-10).

The facts about M and G are these. M. occurs twice on 39a,13 times each on 39b/40a and 40b, 10 times on 41a, 9 times on 41b, 7 times on 42a, 3 times on 42b. G occurs twice on 39b, 3 times on 40a, once each on 40b, 42b, 45a. On 64 occasions M immediately precedes lemmata. The other three occasions are these:- 40a11. M. Illa ergo Gratia dedit tibi consanguineo suo trina dona ... etc. 40b19 M. Hoc ergo Fides dea suadente aruspicio ... etc. 42b14 M. Per illecebrosa Veneris donaria significantur omnia vitia ... etc. In two of these cases the words following the M are text-words serving as lemmata, but padded out by Remigius to make the sense more clear. In the last case I assume the M to have been misplaced.

On six occasions G appears before sentences belonging to Remigius. On two occasions it is followed by a text-word: the latter not being used as a lemma, but having served that function before. For example 39b18 gives us:- G. Auram mentis, i.e. auram que est mens. But "auram mentis" has already appeared as part of a lemma (preceded by M) in line 17. Exceptionally sexus is explained after a G in 39b23, but does not appear as a lemma until the next line - "Concil ians sexus" etc.

The explanation seems simply to be that M and G denote Martianus and Glossa (or Glossator) respectively, and shew a short-lived attempt to distinguish lemma and glosa. A similarly abortive attempt is made by the scribe of Royal 15A XXXIII to write lemmata in capitals. The letters G and M are not confined to Paris 12960, but appear also in Paris nouv. acq. 340, where in the course of the first book there are eight examples of M and nine of G, placed consistently with the explanation I have suggested. The G which 12960 has on 45a corresponds to that which n.a.340 has on 7b (G. Electri duo genera sunt.), but this is the only such coincidence. In Bodleian Canon. Misc 18, which seems to have been copied from the same archetype as n.a.340, there is no example in the first book of M or G; so that their original distribution seems problematical.

But sufficient time has been spent in dissolving these phantasms. From "M" and "G", who are neither names nor realities let us pass to consideration of "Dunchad", whose name is indeed fictitious, but whose reality is undoubted.

4. The Commentary attributed to Dunchad

In the Latin manuscript no. 12960 of the Bibliothéque Nationale there is a fragmentary commentary upon Martianus Capella, which starts at 67,10 and ends at 224,17 Dick, but omits the whole of the third book. The commentary has been ascribed by Traube (Neues Archiv XVIII (1893) p.104) to Dunchad or Dunchat, an Irish bishop. Of this bishop we know that he taught at the monastery of St. Emery at Rheims upon the astronomy of Martianus Capella: this statement resting upon the authority of a superscription in the British Museum's manuscript Royal 15 A XXXIII f.3a. These are the facts. The inference from them that Dunchad is the author of the anonymous commentary is obviously illegitimate. Since however Manitius has popularized the practice of referring to this unknown commentator as Dunchad, and since the name is much more convenient than "Anonymus Parisiensis in Martianum" or the like, I shall propose in the following pages to use the name of Dunchad throughout, but to enclose it in inverted commas as being sanctioned by usage only.

The portion of the manuscript in which this commentary is found is very small - one ternion from 25a-30b, written in a small hand of the ninth century, in double columns. There is one printed edition, by Dr. C.E. Lutz of Wilson College (Dunchad Glossae in Martianum, edited by Cora E. Lutz, Philological

Monographs published by the American Philological Association Number 12, Cambridge Mass. 1944). Of this editor I shall have something to say in a later section.

The text as transmitted by the single manuscript is fairly good, except for the fragmentary nature of the contents. By an accident of transmission part of the commentary of Johannes Scottus upon Martian's rhetoric has been attached at the end. For the rest, the scribe seems to have done his job well. There are none of the monstrous corruptions found in John's commentary, although some have escaped the eye of the editor, as infirmum for infimi on p.2,26, terrentur for torrentur (p.2,30), lunare for solare (p.6,31), who has also provided some of her own as imittoria (p.27,35). But on the whole we have this fragment of the commentary substantially as its author put it together.

In its general form the commentary is very primitive: there is a very high proportion of purely verbal glosses, synonyms, identifications, etymologies and the like, while lengthy or discursive notes are rare, except in the section on dialectic. The impression given by this feature is that the greater part of the commentary consists of a collection of marginalia from a heavily glossed manuscript of Martian. Dr. Lutz has drawn attention to a tendency to depart from the normal line-sequence of the known codices of Martian and a practice of quoting lemma-words

in the nominative where they appear in oblique cases in the text; from which she draws additional evidence for this view. Another striking feature of the commentary is the great number of *lemmata* glossed - Dr. Lutz points out that in two Teubner pages of text "Lunchad" glosses twenty-three *lemmata* where two only are glossed by Johannes Scottus. Nevertheless "Lunchad" is not so voluminous a commentator as Remigius, whose bulk however is attributable not to the number of *lemmata* which he glossed, but to the length of his individual explanations.

Unhappily the quality of the commentary of "Lunchad" is not in proportion to its quantity. Of the surviving commentaries on Martian it is easily the worst. The simplest of passages are wrongly explained, elementary allusions are missed, and identifications of proper names, almost invariably impudent guesses from the context, are frequently perfect portents of folly and ignorance.

A few examples of the glossator's learning will suffice. On Martian 67,12 *Dick* (*effuso per vaticinia carmine*) he explains *effuso* as "multo". On 68,6 he glosses *post vitas* as "postquam nascuntur homines", when it patently means "postquam moriuntur homines". On *incurandi* (69,12) rightly glossed by Remigius as "irruendi et impetum faciendi contra homines", "Lunchad" luminously observes "id est adiuvandi". Of Amphiarus and Mopsus he remarks that they were two shepherds mentioned by Virgil; *antias* (72,16) is "dea auxiliatrix

virginum". But there is no opportunity for his genius to flower fully until the end of Book II, where the great philosophers are fancifully described. Orpheus and Aristoxenus are described as bearing lyres, and at once they are explained - "Isti sunt citharistae". Plato and Archimedes roll golden globes. This is more difficult, but a formula comes pat - "Isti fuerunt astrologi; disputaverunt enim de cursibus septem planetarum". In glossing the lemma HERACLITUS UDUS THALES "Dunchad" seizes upon the context with the strength of desperation and says "Isti de ignea vi disputaverunt". Nothing seems more likely than he took Heraclitus, Udu and Thales as a trio. Next in Martian's catalogue of sages comes Pythagoras - "Samius Pythagoras caelestes quosdam numeros replicabat": not a whit gravelled by this difficulty our Scaliger misreads Samnis for Samius (or is ignorant of the difference) and glosses it as "Beneventanus", and observes that this man was "arithmeticus; qui de arithmetica disputavit". But such a recital of folly becomes tedious. It must suffice to have indicated the depth of ignorance which in the ninth century was compatible with authorship of a large commentary on Martianus Capella.

To analyse the sources of a man who is obviously so far removed from any knowledge of the most common reference-books of his time is no easy task. Of his glosses on rhetoric his editor confesses that they shew no acquaintance with any work on the subject other than that

which they purport to explain, while she declares that in none of his astronomical notes there is any indication that he was really competent in that subject. Nevertheless there are indications that he had read the Saturnalia and the commentary on the Somnium Scipionis of Macrobius, the Origines of Isidore, the Civitas Dei of Augustine and his Liber de LXXXIII Diversis Quaestionibus, the Institutiones of Cassiodorus, Servius' Virgil-commentary and the Mythologiae of Fulgentius. Although Dr. Lutz has observed the use of most of these authorities, she has passed unnoticed a good many borrowings from them. To her indications of sources there should be added the following:

p.2,28 de circulo Martis manans. This seems to be an inference from the doctrine of Macrobius in Som.Scip. I,11, although Macrobius himself nowhere expresses it so crudely.

p.4,13 cornu a luna sumuntur. Isidore, De Natura Rerum 3,4 (quoted below, p.89).

p.4,15 terra. quae in statu est. nullum sonum reddit Cf. Macrobius, Som.Scip. II,4 passim.

p.5,22 quasi narratorium kyrios. Fulgentius, Myth. I,19 (p.29 Helm) quoted below, p.94).

p.6,4 ore canentium. Festus s.v. Oscines, etc.

p.9,33 temperamentum a Iove descendit. Isidore, De Natura Rerum 3,4 (quoted below, p.894).

p.10,17-20 Macrobius, Som.Scip. II,4

p.13,29 in significatione sapientiae. Fulgentius, Myth. II,1 (p.37 Helm).

14.20 crepusculum dubia lux. Isidore, Origines V, 31,6-7; Bede, de Temporibus col. 280A, de Temporum Ratione c.7 col. 325A. Servius on Aen.II,268; Nonius 13M11 (p.20 Lind.).

18,23 Gorzones tres fuere. Fulgentius Myth. I,24 (p.32 Helm.)

27,16 Augustinus. De Diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII, qua est 20.

30,30 Augustinus. The reference is to Pseudo-Augustine de Dialectica col. 1431. Dr. Lutz' note appears to be an oblique attempt to disguise her ignorance of the source.

Of the style of "Dunchad" there is little to be said except that it is jejune and amorphous. Dr. Lutz gravely observes of him that he uses a number of post-classical words (a singular feature, no doubt, in a writer of the ninth century), and uses ipse as a weak demonstrative pronoun (a noticeable mannerism, says she: she might indeed have noticed it in the Beatitudes, if she had cared to look), and finally that he sometimes separates the noun from its modifier (a practice which could be exemplified from any Latin author of whom a dozen words survive). There may be readers who are grateful for this information, but I cannot include myself among their number.

Let this be sufficient time to have spent upon "Dunchad", whose works, in a more enlightened age, would have been left in oblivion. Of his use as one of Remigius's sources I shall speak later: of his editor also more must be said in connection with

SECTION 5. THE COMMENTARY OF JOHANNES SCOTTUS**Part 1. The Manuscripts**

The commentary of Johannes Scottus upon Martianus Capella is found today in two manuscripts, namely fonds latin 12960 of the Bibliothèque Nationale and Auct. T. II. 19 of the Bodleian Library, Oxford. To these manuscripts I shall refer hence forward as C and B respectively, as Miss Labowsky has done in the article (Medieval and Renaissance Studies I, 1943, p. 187) in which she has described the latter. These manuscripts are both of the ninth century, and might conceivably have been written within the life-time of their author, so that it is not unreasonable to ask whether either of them is John's own autograph. This question was asked in the case of C by Haureau (Notices et Extraits XI, 2, 1862, p. 8), who suggested that here we might indeed have an autograph manuscript. Whether this view is tenable on palaeographical grounds or no, I cannot judge; nor do I think it necessary to enquire, since it can be proved by a study of the text presented to us in this manuscript that, whoever wrote it, Johannes Scottus did not; or at least that, if he wrote it, he corrupted his own text as he went along. From the great number of corruptions (see below, Appendix 1) I need only cite two.

20,20 Iutz. ALIUS LACTIS INSTAR Iovialem dicit ambitum, qui, quoniam inter frigiditatem Saturni superioris et fervorem inferioris Martis medietatem quandam obtinet, temperatam equalitatis est, ac per hoc candidum argenteumque possidet colorem.

The true reading is obviously temperatae qualitatis.

18,23 Iutz. SUCCUMBAT Hoc dicit quia dum stella Iovis in coitu solis est, appagere non valens, vetuti qui et existimatur recumbere.

We must obviously read veluti quietus existimatur recumbere.

It is quite impossible that a man writing out his own work could make such errors as these. B, as we shall see, is not John's work.

Since therefore neither of the manuscripts was written by John, it remains to be seen (if possible) in what relation they stand to John's original autograph. This inquiry may best be made in two sections, the first dealing with the commentary on Books II - IX, the second with that on Book I.

From the beginning of Book II onwards B and C exhibit substantially the same text, the most striking difference being that in C there are two versions of the commentary on Book IV, the first being incomplete (it goes only from 151,1 D to 174,11 D). This incomplete version however contains nothing that is not found in the complete version which follows, but exhibits sometimes the same glosses word for word, sometimes the same material in a simpler and more jejune form, while in many cases it omits material given in the second version. So close is the similarity that some glosses even exhibit the same corruptions in both versions. Two examples will suffice.

On 152,22 Disk

Text of First Version (as in C)

Vertier. sive enim universalem primo quis dixerit & secundo particularem abdicativam primo quis ponat & secunda universalem dedicativam.

Videtur recurrere & ambas veras esse.

Text of Complete Version (as in C)

Sed ambas posse vertier. Ac si dixisset sive universalem dedicativam primo loco ponas & secundo loco particularem abdicativam primo & universalem dedicativam secundo. Videntur recurrere & ambas veras esse.

The corruption was observed by Haureau, who proposed to read in the second case - "sive universalem dedicativam primo loco ponas et secundo loco particularem abdicativam, (sive particularem abdicativam) primo et universalem dedicativam secundo, videntur recurrere ...etc." This acute conjecture is proved right by the text of B (see Appendix I, on 9,5 luts). It is a measure of Dr. Lutz' critical acumen that, while adopting Haureau's correction here, she does not make this necessary alteration in the first passage.

On 172,13 Dick

Text of First Version (as in C)

Magis iustus. Iustus quando de pio iusto dicitur. non recipit magis & minus. Quando autem de voluptate. Tunc recipit magis & minus.

Text of Second Version (as in C)

Magis Iustus. Iustus quando de pio iusto dicitur. non recipit magis & minus. vel quando per se intelligitur. Quando autem de voluptate accipitur. tunc recipit magis & minus.

Dr. Lutz finds no difficulty in the reading. Of course we must read quando de perfecto iusto dicitur and quando autem de voluntate.

What therefore are we to think of the phenomenon of the two versions? They are obviously not different commentaries, and they are obviously taken in part at least from the same corrupt manuscript. It seems to me most likely that the incomplete version is merely an inadequately reported version of the complete one, and was abandoned by the scribe when a better source came to hand, as Professor Rand suggested (op. cit. p. 520). I find it hard however to agree with Professor Rand when he says (p. 521) "One might imagine that various class-room copies of the master's notes got into circulation. Certain coincidences however between the two versions of the commentary on Book IV induce me to suspect that only one such version was produced." If the glosses on Books II - IX do indeed represent a class-room copy of the master's notes, it is most unlikely that they should have been the only copy. A series of lectures given to ten students produces ten sets of lecture-notes, differing one from another according to the diligence, speed in writing, and quickness of apprehension of the ten individuals. But I shall return to a consideration of the transmission later.

The scribe of B gives us the complete version of the commentary on Book IV and omits the imperfect version entirely. For the other books B is substantially in agreement with C, except that in Book II there are some variations in individual glosses. A glance at Appendix I will shew that neither of the manuscripts can have been copied from the

other. C. has many errors not found in B, B likewise many that are not found in C. Yet in many places the two agree in error. It might easily be assumed that the two come from a common archetype, and I see nothing to disprove such a view except in Books II and IV. In Book II there are many glosses found in B only. This fact in itself would only indicate that B is interpolated; and so I believe it is, since two lengthy notes found only in B are taken almost word for word from "Dunchad". But in one place there is a substitution of an entirely different gloss for that which is given in C :-

On 50,16 Dick

Text of C

MAGNESIA regio nobilissima Scithiae ubi abundant poete et flumina,
ibique canes optimi sunt.

Text of B

Magnesia est vicina Thessaliae, cuius fons Libethris poetici
haustus nomine celebratus.

Even though the note in C is so uncommonly silly, it is most unlikely that a scribe would have had the temerity to throw it out if he found it in his archetype, in order to replace it by one which he thought better. Since the additional matter contained in B's version of the commentary on Book II is generally intelligent and judicious, I am inclined to think that we have here a copy of an interpolated version of John's commentary prepared by a fairly learned contemporary, possibly even by Remigius

himself at an early stage in his collection of material for the glossing of Martian. It is not of course possible that Remigius himself wrote this copy of John, since there are countless elementary blunders in copying of which he would have been incapable.

For Book IV, as we have seen, the scribe of B must have used either the archetype of C's second version or a manuscript very like it. For Books III and V - IX there seems to be no conclusive proof that B and C are not derived from the same archetype, and since the postulation of such an archetype explains well enough the frequent agreement of the two manuscripts in error, it may provisionally be adopted.

The result for the text-criticism of the commentary is that neither manuscript can be disregarded. At any given moment sense is the only guide to tell us whether B is right or C or neither. Compared with the manuscripts of Remigius which I have studied, both B and C are very corrupt, particularly in the later books. The frequency with which lemmata are omitted or glosses attached to the wrong lemmata leads me to believe that at least in the glosses on Book IX, there has been at one stage in the transmission a manuscript of Martian with marginal glosses, and that a scribe entrusted with the task of excerpting John's comments therefrom has made a bad job of it.

The commentary upon Book I raises a very different problem. That contained in B is widely divergent from that contained in C, and the question of authenticity must be faced. Miss Labowsky gives her opinion

upon the question as follows:- "Pending a thorough comparison of the two versions of Book I, we should be inclined to say that they both belong to the same author, Scotus Eriugena, but that C contains a later and more amplified version." (op. cit. p. 190). For my part I cannot accept this conclusion, which seems to me to be based on a plentiful lack of evidence. Miss Labowsky says (op. cit. p. 189) that "the material and the whole trend of the argument in the individual interpretations are very similar to, and often identical with, those in the Paris manuscript." Unhappily this statement is simply not true. Agreement between the two commentaries is the exception rather than the rule: indeed there is much more similarity between the commentary of Hemigius and that of John as given in C than there is between these two versions. It will unfortunately be necessary to quote at some length to support this view, but I hope that tedious evidence may be better than no evidence.

On 5,8 Dick

Text of C (Lutz p. 6,10)

EPICA Epicum carmen dicitur quod epicis, id est laudabilibus conficitur pedibus. ἔπος enim a Grecis laus dicitur. Pedes enim laudabiles sunt: iambus trocheus spondeus dactylus anapaestus et ex his compositi.

Text of B (f. 4a)

EPICA dicuntur omnia carmina ex omnibus pedibus composita propter superexcellencia. Epi enim super dicitur, epicos excelsus,

inde epica superexcellencia. Eadem etiam vocant eroica propter honorem & virtutem, quia virorum fortium carmina maxime vocantur eroica.

On 7,10 Dick

Text of C (p.10.16 Lutz)

Endelichia ut Calceidius in expositione Timei Platonis exponit perfecta aetas interpretatur. Aetas quippe adulta ΕΛΕΚΙΑ a Grecis dicitur. Endelichia vero quasi endos ΕΛΕΚΙΑ, hoc est intima aetas. Generalem quippe mundi animam Endelichiam Plato nominat, ex qua speciales animae sive rationabiles sint sive ratione carentes in singulas mundani corporis partes sole administrante vel potius procreante procedunt, ut Platonici perhibent. Quorum sectam Martianus sequitur asserens Psichen, hoc est animam, Endelichia ac solis esse filiam.

Text of B (f.5a)

Endelechia vocatur perfecta aetas. Eliche aetas generalis. Ideo autem dicitur anima esse filia solis (quae Grece vocatur ΜΥΣ) quia dum anima ad perfectam aetatem pervenerit, Endelechia vocatur. Perfecta igitur anima a claritate scientiae dicitur.

On 8,1 Dick

Text of C (Lutz p.12.26)

ANIE dicitur quasi ananoia, id est recognitio. Potest etiam Anie quasi anieia, id est libertas, intelligi.

Text of B (f.6a)

ANIA intelligentia. NIA enim intelligentia ab eo quod est NUS dicitur. A apud Grecos multa significat; per vices enim negat, per vices implet, sicut in hoc nomine ANIA: ibi enim auget sensum.

On 8,4 Dick

Text of C (Luta p.13.1)

LEMNIUS ipse est Vulcanus, a Lemno insula in qua fingitur habitasse, denominatus.

Text of B. (f.6a)

LEMNIUS Vulcanus a Lemno insula, ubi intrat ventus cum aqua intus in terram, et est iuxta Siciliam. Ibi enim fingitur officina Vulcani esse.

On 9,6-10 Dick

Text of C (Luta. p.14.32)

Aiunt quippe astrologi stellam Mercurii a sole nunquam amplius disparari quam unius signi, id est triginta partium spatio, sive velocior praecesserit, sive tardior retrograda remanserit.

Sepissime autem ac pene semper soli coire perhibetur ac per hoc radiis eius occultari et rarissime apparere; et hoc est quod ait MENSTRUA PRAECURSIONE, unius videlicet mensis intervallo.

Text of B (f.6b)

Menstrua praecursione. Ideo hoc dicit quia Venus elongatur a sole plus quam spatium unius mensis, id est quadraginta sex partibus, Mercurius vero elongatur a sole viginti duabus.

Mercurius igitur, qui nunquam separatur a sole plus quam viginti partibus, non debuerat sine suo fratre aliquod consilium agere.

On 10,7 Dick

Text of C (Intz p.26)

ELICON est Parnasi montis cornu, in quo farum Apollini fuerat constructum.

Text of B (fol. 7b)

Item eum in Elicona. Elicon enim vocatur Appollo quia trahebat omnes homines ad se. Elico enim tractus dicitur.

On 10,9 Dick

Text of C (Intz p.17.10)

CREPIDAS Crepis a Grecis pavimentum dicitur, MURCIDAS quasi marcidas, hoc est marcescendo ruinosas.

Text of B (f.7b)

Crepidat myrcidas, id est fundamenta myrtea. Mirce enim dicitur virtus.

These examples, all taken from the first seven folios of B, are enough to shew that the two commentaries are as different as chalk from cheese. There are of course many glosses in which there is a considerable similarity, but it would be incredible if there were not, since human error is not so varied in its manifestations as to enable two commentaries upon the same work to be totally dissimilar.

In order to decide whether B has any right to be considered the work of Johannes Scottus, we must consider both internal and external

evidence. The latter may most easily be taken first, since it can be disposed of quickly.

In his commentary on Book I of Martians Capella Remigius quotes the opinion of Johannes Scottus twice. From these two quotations Hauréau was able to identify the commentary in C as that of Johannes. If the material thus quoted were not found in the commentary preserved in B, we should have no more trouble. But unhappily, although the versions of C and B are so different, as we have seen, both contain material which can be identified with that which Remigius ascribes to John. I subjoin the passages of Remigius together with the corresponding passages of B and C.

On 36,2 Dick

Remigius (BM Royal 15A XXXIII f. 34v)

Quaestas oppressione, .i. rapina & iniustitia: semper enim divitiae aliorum oppressione aliis proveniunt. Quidam "oppressione .i. labore" accipiunt, sicut Johannes Scottus.

B f. 30a

Oppressione: labore.

C (Luta p. 48.14)

DIVITIAS OPPRESSIONE QUAESTITAS Hoc ait quia divitiae absque oppressione, hoc est labore non adquiruntur. Vel potius Neptunus spernit divitias quas Pluto navigio mare opprimens per diversas mundi regiones quaerit.

On 36,17 Dick

Remigius (f. 35b)

Quis inter eos, .i. inter supra memoratos; et est eclipsis, hoc est defectio locutionis. Ita tamen potest iungi:- Erant subandis, decernentes femine, .i. diiudicantes, quis inter eos, .i. praedictos esset vel melior vel pulchrior aut fortior. Iohannes vero Scottus ad superiora iungit, et "quis pro qualis" accipit. Cernebat, inquit, Iuno quis, .i. qualis & quantus esset Hercules inter eos cum quibus gradiebatur. Et hic facta distinctione subsequitur, Erant decernentes femine; decernentes quia altera virginales, altera nuptias praeferebat.

Text of B. (f. 30b)

Quis pro qualis, et sic iungitur:- Cernebat quis, pro qualis. Discernentes: iudicantes, quia una laudabat virginitatem, altera nuptias.

Text of C (Lata n. 49.32)

QUIS pro qualis, ac si diceret: SUBLIMIS IUNO CERNEBAT, hoc est mirabatur, qualis esset Hercules, deinde subiungit INTER EOS, filios videlicet, DECERNENTES, hoc est contententes, FEMINE, subauditur a superioribus admissae erant. QUARUM UNAM. Dianam dicit & Venerem; Diana quippe fastrata virgo venationibusque dedita, silvis assueta, Venus vero admodum plura humanisque generationibus veluti omnium mater delectata fingitur.

From these passages scholars ranging from Max Manitius to Cora Lutz have concluded that the commentary now preserved in C was known to Remigius as the commentary of Johannes Scottus. Such a conclusion was unexceptionable in the days before B was discovered, but a critical examination of the corresponding passages from B will, I think, lead to a different view. In the first passage Remigius says that Johannes Scottus takes "oppressiones" as meaning "labore". The author of the commentary in B does exactly that. The author of the commentary in C first takes "oppressiones" as meaning "labore", and then substitutes an explanation which he thinks preferable, introduced by "vel potius". In the second passage Remigius says that Johannes Scottus takes "cernebat quis" closely with "inter eos", then punctuates strongly (facta distinctione), and goes on with "Decernentes feminas". It is hard to say whether the explanation of "decernentes" is to be taken as that offered by John or not. Now the commentator in B takes "quis" as signifying qualis, joins "cernebat" with "quis", but makes no mention of "inter eos". He then makes a break, and goes on with "decernentes feminas" ("discernentes" is a purely scribal error). Like Remigius, he explains "decernentes" as meaning indicantes, and gives the same explanation of their behaviour that Remigius does. The author of the commentary in C does indeed explain "quis" as equivalent to "qualis", and joins it to the foregoing "cernebat". But he makes his break before, not after "inter eos", explains "decernentes" as meaning contentantes, and gives a different reason for the behaviour of the

two women. In other words the commentary contained in B more closely resembles that of Johannes Scottus as described by Remigius than does that found in C. So much then for the external evidence.

The internal evidence tells another tale. I propose to deal first of all with the matter, and secondly with the style, as far as each bears upon the question of authenticity.

From the large number of Greek etymologies in this commentary, many of which I have been unable to trace elsewhere, it appears that the author was a man who knew a fair amount of Greek. Hymeneus is absurdly connected with "himenos", i.e. ἡμέρος, and made to mean sasilis. Thalamus is derived ἀπὸ τοῦ θαλήματος; tonus is correctly derived from τείνω, and the like. The commentator makes an interesting attempt to translate the Greek verse in 15,7 Dick, where he follows a better text than that used by the author of C. Here is what he makes of it:—

	Apollo	loetifer	peste	nubem	egena	utit
of it:—	ΦΟΕΒΟΣ	ΑΚΕΡΕΚΟΜΗC	ΛΙΜΟΥ	ΝΕΦΕΛΗΝ	ΑΠΟΡΟΥ	ΚΕΙ

ΑΚΕΡΕΚΟΜΗC compositum est ab eo quod est ΧΕΙΡ id est mors, et ΚΟΜΙΖΟ id est fero, id est mortem fero". Although poor enough by classical or modern standards, this performance is remarkable for its learning in the ninth century. It may be objected that the translation so painfully reached yields no real sense, but in this respect it is no worse than John's "sapient vel virtus vir mala et contraria fecit." But the Greek erudition of our commentator comes to the fore even more strikingly in two other passages. In the first of these he mentions

Gregory of Nyssa:-- "Gregorius Nyseus, germanus Basilii, ait quia invenis quidam dicebat se esse aliquando sicut vir, aliquando sicut femina, vel etiam sicut volatile vel sicut piscis vel sicut rana".

(f.11b). Gregory of Nyssa is of course one of John's favourite Greek Fathers. The second passage is so remarkable that it deserves to be quoted in extenso.

On 20,22 Dick

Iambicum metrum duabus legibus destinatur, tragica (traica god) vel comica. Si autem tragica specie scribimus, haec observare nos convenit, ne in sex pedibus, quos choras Greci appellant, in secundo vel quarto aut sexto sit spondeus loco, sed in primo vel tertio vel quinto. Admittit (amittit god.) autem hoc metrum etiam dactylum atque eius contrarium anapestum in prima versus parte, ut Euripides usus est, vel in prime regionis emolis (sin) locis, hoc est imparibus, cuius exemplum est apud Euripidem

ΗΑΗ ΗΟΙΣ ΙΠΠΟΥΣΙΝ ΕΙΛΙΣΣΟΝ ΦΛΑΚΤΑ

et apud Martianum

Possem minore ambigens fiducia

In quo metro in primo loco et iambus et spondeus et dactylus et anapestus invenitur, in tertio saepe spondeus, in quinto sepiissime spondeus; et haec species iambicum tragicum vocatur.

The line of Euripides is Phoenissae 3, Ἡλιε, θεαῖς ἵπποισιν εἰλίσσον φλόγα

I think it is only just to attribute the corruption in large measure to the scribe, since the scansion of the verse does not agree as written

with the account given of it by the commentator, while the original verse of Euripides does. The verse is taken from Macrobius (Sat. I, 17), but its application to illustrate a metrical point indicates that the author has considerable confidence in his Greek learning.

Another interesting feature of the commentary in B is that the inferior planets are said to revolve round the sun, in accordance with the theory of Martian expressed on p.449,26 Dick. This view is uncommon, though not unparalleled, in the Middle Ages, and it seems at first to agree with the views of Johannes Scottus. But in fact, so far as one can gather from the obscure and corrupt passages in which John unfolds his cosmology, he held a different view, namely that Jupiter and Mars, Venus and Mercury revolve round the sun, while Saturn, the moon and the sun revolve round the earth. (This is the theory expressed in the De Divisione Naturae (PL 122,698A) with relative clarity: in the Annotationes John seems to say that all the planets revolve round the sun. I refuse of course to accept Dr. Lutz' emendation making Saturn alone revolve round the earth).

To sum up the fore-going points, we may say that the unknown commentator shews a knowledge of Greek comparable with that of Johannes Scottus, but in his interpretation of Greek differs considerably, while his astronomical views, although having some affinity with those of Johannes, are different in detail. We may pass now to considerations of style.

The style of the commentaries of Johannes Scottus has been handled by Professor Rand in the article which has been mentioned, p. 504-506. Of the stylistic criteria which he brings forward the most striking, I think, is the immense preponderance of hoc est over id est. To verify Professor Rand's statements I read through some pages of an undoubtedly authentic work, the Expositiones super Hierarchiam Caelestem S. Dionysii (from PL 122, 125-159). In this space hoc est appeared 64 times, id est 9 times, while the formula ac si diceret (with occasional variants) appeared 15 times, and the illative particle siquidem 10 times: in the rest of the work the same features occur with equal frequency. Now in the commentary preserved in C these and other idiosyncrasies appear frequently, as Professor Rand has pointed out. In B on the other hand id est is about three times more frequent than hoc est, and the other stylistic features which I have mentioned are very rare or non-existent. Nevertheless the style is not uniform. Frequently there are the barest of verbal glosses or the utmost brevity in exposition, but in other places a far more generous allotment of space is made and a far more discursive treatment adopted. One of these passages, although lengthy, is worthy of quotation in full. It occurs on f. 11b, and explains Martian p. 11, 20 seqq. So strongly was this passage felt by the scribe to differ in character from the rest of the commentary that he gave it a separate heading.

DE ARMONIA CAELESTIUM MOTUUM SIDERUMQUE SONORUM

Octo sunt soni, planetarum videlicet septem et sphaerae unus, quorum gravissimus Saturni est, acutissimus vero sphaericus. Perinde sphaerae sonus sono Saturni ratione quadrupli consonat ac bis diapason efficiunt ut in organo vel fidibus principalis principalium & ultima excellentium. Sonus vero solis est inter Saturnum et sphaeram sicut mese inter duas praedictas cordas. Superat enim Saturnum duplo eique consonat diapason: superatur autem a sphaera duplo, & aliam diapason componunt, ubi mirabilis naturae virtus admiranda est. Nam quod in tetrachordis quinis conficitur, hoc in octo sonis caelestibus completur. Sed qua ratione peragitur diligenti indagatione quaerendum est. Primo igitur intellige tres planetas quae supra solem locorum situ sunt graviorum sonitum esse. Nec immerito, quoniam et in amplioribus mundi spatiis moventur & nimia celeritate sphaerae, cui contrarium cursum peragunt, ne tantae velocitatis sint impediuntur. Quae autem sub sole localiter, quoniam et longius a sphaerica velocitate distant et in brevioribus mundi spatiis discurrunt, acutiores sonos extendunt; ac per hoc non locorum positio, sed proportionis sonorum ratio caelestem efficit armoniam, praesertim cum non sinat ratio: sursum & deorsum localiter in universo. In qualitate vero sonorum gravitas et acumen mediaeque varietates succincentes diversas efficiunt simphonias. Fiat igitur diatonicum genus pro exemplo. Sol ad Saturnum diapason

dupla ratione; sphaera ad solem similiter diapason alteram reddit:
 ac per hoc sphaera Saturno in quadrupli ratione consonat bis
 diapason. Et notandum quod omnis diapason octo sonis, septem
 spatiis, sex tonis consistat. Est ergo primus in gravioribus
 Saturnus, cui proximus Iovis tono coniungitur: Iovi similiter
 Mars tono, sol Marti hemitonio, et diatessaron in sesquitertia
 proportionis sol ad Saturnum consistit (consistat qod.). In
 eisdem quoque sonis sol ad Saturnum sesquialteram consonat sim-
 phoniam sic - a Saturno ad Iovem tonus, ab Iove ad Martem tonus,
 a Marte ad solem tonus, et habes diapente simul et diatessaron
 inter solem & Saturnum. Et ne mireris solem ceteris planetis
 multiplici proportionis convenire (diximus enim cum tribus modis
 concinere Saturno, in dupla videlicet et sesquitertia et sesquialtera
 copulatione), cum videas non eisdem intervallis semper soni
 appropinquare, sed secundum absidarum altitudinem. Quid ergo
 mirum si sol Saturno diapason in duplo concinat dum in longissimis
 ab eo distantis currit, ubi vero coeperit ei appropinquare,
 diapente in sesquialtera? At si ei proxime accesserit diatessaron
 in sesquitertia sonabit. Hac autem ratione considerata non te
 movebit, ut opinor, quod diximus etiam de Marte, tono videlicet
 aliquotiens a sole distare, aliquotiens emitonio. Quod enim
 valet in cordis extensio et remissio, longitudo et brevitudo,
 sicut in fistulis organi, in quibus spatium (spatia qod.)
 longitudinis vocum facit distantiam; hoc idem in planetis absidarum

altitudo et a sole elongantia aut ei propinquitas. Et quod de sole diximus, hoc ipsum de omnibus planetis inter se invicem intelligendum est: non enim eisdem intervallis semper aut a se invicem distant aut sibi invicem appropinquant pro conditione absidarum; ac per hoc in octo caelestibus sonis omnes musicas consonantias fieri posse credendum est, non tantum per tria genera, diatonicum dico, chromaticum et enarmonicum, verum etiam

in aliis ultra omnium mortalium ratiocinationem, ^{supra} vero ^{vacuum} ^{intra} vero ^{positione} ^{locorum}, ut sensibus mortalium videtur. Ita diapason potest eadem altitudine (altitudinem god.) et primo habet diatessaron ad lunam, ^{inveniri: sol ad sphaeram diapason coniungit} [^] et primo ei Venus tono consonat, Veneri Mercurius tono altero,

luna Mercurio hemitonio. Diapente vero in eisdem spatiis consonat dum Venus soli tono, Mercurius Veneri tono, luna Mercurio emitonio, sphaera lunae tono respondeant. Et notandum quod illi toni qui a terra computantur ad sphaeram, verbi gratia "a terra ad lunam tonus", non sint in proportionibus vocum, sed in intervallis locorum: tonorum enim multae species sunt: siquidem toni sunt intervalla siderum, hoc est quantum distat unusquodque ab alio quantumque luna elongatur a terra, qui toni pro diversitate absidarum et circulorum variantur. Quam speciem tonorum Martianus diffinit dicens "Tonus est spatium cum legitima quantitate", quae species in musica diastema vocatur. Sunt toni temporum, in longitudine et brevitate constituta; sunt toni spirituum, in spissitudine et exilitate vocum; sunt toni armonici, de quibus

nunc agitur, in gravitate et altitudine sonorum, ex quibus omnis proportionalitas simphoniarum constituitur. Itaque quemadmodum in organo non consideratur in quo loco sit fistula, sed qualis vox ipsius est et quot et quibus coniungitur et quales proportionales efficit - unaquaeque fistula diversis copulata diversas efficit simfonias - sic non locus siderum, sed sonus caelestem componit armoniam. Quod verum moveantur voces siderum iuxta spatia absidarum, nec mirum, cum et colores eadem causa mutant, et cordam in breviori et in longiori spatio positam aut extentam et remissam, cum sit eadem, non eandem vocem reddere videamus (videmus god.). Tonus autem ex tendendo dicitur, et est Graecum et derivatur a verbo τείνω hoc est extendo; quod vero in octavis proprie ponitur, usus musicorum fecit, quoniam omnium proportionum communis mensura est. Et ne mireris quia diximus "a luna ad solem tonum". Non enim locorum tonos, hoc est spatia hic consideramus, sed vocum consonantias. Dum enim rationabiliter ex gravissimo omnium sonorum, Saturno videlicet, inchoavimus, et proportionali ascensione ad solaris soni medietatem ascendimus, indeque superius rationem extendentes ad acutissimum planetarum omnium lunarem sonitum - nec immerito, quoniam angustissimum circulorum omnium meatum optinet - pervenimus, quo altius ascendere non valentes ad caelestis sphaerae acutissimum omnium sonorum motum ratio nos perduxit, ideoque acutissimum omnium planetarum sonorum acutissimo extimoque totius mundi motum tonica proportione copulavimus: causa igitur

erroris multis fit ignorantia tonorum, existimantes tonum illum quo luna^{distat} a terra ad proportionem vocum caelestium pertinere, non animadvertentes primum quidem quod tonus musicus non nisi inter duos sonos constituitur, terra autem quia in statu est nullum efficit sonum, inter terram igitur et lunam musicus tonus non est; deinde quod nunquam musica intervalla stadiorum numero mensurata sunt, sed sola rationabili extentionum ascensione secundum regulas numerorum: aliud est enim centum viginti sex milia stadiorum mensurare a terra ad lunam, aliud inter numerum CXCII et CCXVI XXIV unitates. Ibi tonus est CXXVI milia stadiorum, hic octava pars minoris numeri tonus est XXIV. Utamur ergo exemplo quodam quo manifestius appareat quod conamur asserere. In choro, ubi multi simul cantantes consonant, non locus in quo unusquisque constituitur, sed proportio suae vocis consideratur. In quocumque enim loco fuerit qui gravissimam vocem emittit, necesse est gravissimam vocum omnium proportionem optineat. Eadem ratione ubicumque in choro sit qui acutissimam vocem profert, necessario sonorum omnium acumen tenebit. De succinentibus similiter intelligendum, quorum non localis positio, sed proportionalis vociferatio in universitate modulaminis diiudicatur. Frustra igitur localium intervallorum rationibus caelestem musicam coartari arbitrantur, in qua (quo scd.) nihil aliud conspicitur nisi gravitatis et acuminis ascensus atque descensus. Ut enim ascendit gravitas in altitudinem decrecendo donec in acumine

finem imponat, sic altitudo descendit similiter decrecendo
quatenus in gravitatem terminum suum constituat.

There are several points of interest in this passage. Firstly, it argues in its author, as it assumes in its readers, a considerable acquaintance with music both theoretical and practical. This of course does not show that John wrote it: he did indeed take a keen interest in music, as Professor Rand points out, but so also did Remigius and many others, so that we can only say that in this respect there is nothing which hinders us believing that he wrote it. But the style is quite remarkable for the number of Johannine features. Hoc est occurs three times, ac per hoc three times, ne mireris and notandum quod twice each, while one example each is found of quid mirum si and aliud ... aliud. I have already spoken of hoc est. Ac per hoc occurs ten times in the Expositiones super Hierarchiam Coelestem, and is frequent in the De Divisione Naturae and the De Praedestinatione. Ne mireris I have found three times in the Expositiones, notandum quod twelve times, quid mirum (non mirum) si five times, and aliud ... aliud three times. In the sentence structure also I seem to see traces of John's clumsy and obscure style. With the three examples of portentous parentheses occurring in the passage just cited one may compare such a sentence as the following (Expositiones, 129A)

Si enim summa bonitas, quae Deus est, omnia quae voluit propterea fecit ut, quoniam per seipsam invisibilis et inaccessibilis lux est, omnem sensum et intellectum superans, per ea quae ab ipsa

facta sunt, veluti per quasdam incubrationes in notitiam intellectualis et rationalis creaturae possit descendere - quod etiam Apostolus edocet; ait enim "Invisibilia eius a creatura mundi per ea quae facta sunt intellecta conspiciuntur" - quid mirum, si omne quod inaccessibilem lucem quodammodo, ut accessibilis sit, puris intellectibus introducit, lumen illuminans animos, et in cognitionem Creatoris sui eos revocans nulla ratione obstante intelligatur?

There are several other passages in B which seem to me reminiscent of John's ways of writing and thinking, but I have said enough to shew that in this one passage at least there is nothing to hinder and much to encourage the belief that John was the original author.

If we sum up the rather extended observations that have gone before, we find the following facts. On external evidence B has as good a claim as C, if not rather better, to be considered as the commentary of Johannes Scottus. On general stylistic grounds B seems not to be his work; in some passages nevertheless there are indications either in matter or form of John's authorship. One such passage is of disproportionate length, when compared with the general brevity of the exposition.

From these facts only one conclusion can be drawn: that the commentary preserved in B is not the commentary of Johannes Scottus, but is a compilation, incorporating much material taken from him which has not survived elsewhere. Where the other material in B comes from is hard to say. Clearly in some passages we have to do with a man whose

Greek learning by the standards of his time was very great. We may have here some more fragments of the teachings of Martin of Laon on Martianus Capella, like those preserved in the "Scholica Glossarum", but such a guess can probably never be substantiated.

Of the authenticity of C I propose to say as little as possible. By assuming some inaccuracy in Remigius' representation of John's interpretations one may conveniently identify this commentary with that cited by Remigius, and the stylistic features strongly support the attribution, as Professor Rand has pointed out (op. cit. p.504). To deny its authenticity therefore would be to become a prey to delirium delens.

If it be asked which of the two commentaries which we have discussed, regardless of its actual authorship, was that associated by Remigius with the name of Johannes Scottus, it is difficult to reply with certainty. The ability of Remigius to make mistakes in attribution through confusing two similar passages is demonstrated in the cases of Ovid and Statius (see below, p.177) and it is only too likely that he should have made a similar mistake here. That he was acquainted with both commentaries I shall shew below (p.163 seqq.).

Part 2 The Original Form of the Commentary

In his article (TAPA 71, 1940, p. 501 seq.) on the commentary of Johannes Scottus upon Martianus Capella, Professor Rand came to the conclusion that the text of the manuscript C gave us the finished work of Johannes Scottus in the first book only, the other books being merely notes taken from his lectures. This conclusion was based on two main arguments: firstly that the glosses on the later books are much shorter than those on the first, and secondly that only in the first book are the stylistic features of John's other writings to be found. That the later books cannot be dismissed as spurious is demonstrated by external evidence in that they are cited by Remigius under John's name.

As far as the text of C goes, this view is quite satisfactory; but the evidence of the manuscript B raises some difficulties. We have seen that it differs from C in its text of the first, second and fourth books. In the case of the fourth book the scribe of B seems to have had at hand only a manuscript like that from which the second version of the glosses in C was taken: in the second book a slightly interpolated version seems to have been used. In neither case is Professor Rand's theory upset. In the first book however a serious problem arises. As we have seen, B's version of the first book cannot be thought of as an early draft of the same commentary which we have in C, yet nevertheless there is at least one lengthy

passage in it which seems to have been written by John. Now if in fact B contains some of John's authentic notes on Book I of Martian, obviously the text given by C can no longer be considered as his finished work.

The alternatives are these. Believing the first book in C to be the finished product, we can deny that the apparently Johannine passage in B is in fact by John at all, or we can believe that it was written by John, but not intended for the place where it is now found, or that it was written by John for its present place, but afterwards suppressed by him without mention when he wrote out a definitive version of his commentary. Or believing that it was written by John and intended for its present place, we can deny that the commentary in C is the definitive version.

That the last hypothesis should be true, is very unlikely. If it is not John's finished work, then it is presumably a compilation by one or more of his hearers: and if so, its stylistic differences from the other books are very hard to explain. Likewise it seems very unlikely that the passage in question should not be John's work, since it is full of his stylistic idiosyncrasies. That it should have been suppressed by its author without a word is almost impossible to accept, since it is by no means inferior to much of his other material. The remaining hypothesis, that it was written by John for some other place, I believe to be the true explanation. The compiler

of the commentary in B may well have found this isolated gloss written at the end of a text of Martian which had belonged to John (it is of course far too long to have been written in the margin) and may have taken it as referring to the passage in Book I where the rivers flowing round Apollo's throne represent allegorically the astrological influences of the seven planets. In fact however it seems to have been written as an excursus upon the passage in Book II where Philologia and her escort rise through the seven circles tone by tone, the first step being one of 126,000 stades (69,19 Lick). That John's doctrines and those of Martian do not wholly agree, is not surprising, since it is well known that John is always ready to be sharply critical of the authors whose works he is expounding (see his notes on Martian 10,20; 13,1; 174,11; 175,13), and consideration of what his author was saying would not have deterred him from expounding what he took to be true doctrine.

It seems then most likely that Professor Rand's opinion is the true one, and that the commentary on Book I as given in C is the authentic commentary of John, and that the later books represent notes made by his students from his verbal teachings.

The question whether there was ever a more complete version of John's commentary has been asked by Manitius and by Rand (Max Manitius in *Neues Archiv* XLIX 1930-32) p.173; E.K. Rand, *op. cit.* p.503). Both have given an affirmative answer, and both have based

their belief upon arguments from the commentary of Remigius. In speaking of the sources of the latter's commentary I shall give reasons for considering their case not proven on the evidence hitherto brought forward. The new evidence taken from B however provides valuable support for their view, provided that the lost annotations are not thought of as a complete and continuous commentary like that upon Book I. If there ever was a complete commentary of Johannes Scottus, it is unlikely that only the first book should have survived, since for Martian and his commentators alike the standard point of division was at the end of Book II (thus Basle F.v.17 Berne 331, Munich 4559, Bodelian Canon Misc. 18). This argument is insufficient in itself, but is supported by the misplacement of the passage on the music of the spheres in B, which would never have been put in the wrong place by a compiler, if it had formed part of a continuous commentary upon Book II. Likewise if there had been in Remigius' possession a full and thorough commentary of John's upon all the nine books, it is likely that he would have cited among his six references to it at least one passage which has since perished. Since in fact all the six references are to passages found in the extant glosses, we are bound to be very chary of believing that a full commentary of John's underlies that of Remigius. That fragments of John's teaching may have been widely scattered among his students

and others who knew him can well be believed, but that he ever wrote a full commentary must remain doubtful until fresh evidence is discovered.

The conditions under which the extant glosses took shape can only be guessed at, but I think there are indications of a mixed written and spoken transmission. Most of the corruptions in the text arise from bad copying (see Appendix 1 on Lutz p.90,32; 91,5; 122,5; 123,28; 126,27), but there are some which seem to have arisen from mis-hearing. Thus affitiantur for infitiantur (128,20 Lutz) culmen for fulmen (145,7), quantum for santum (146,12), Poetio for Boetio (150,22) could more easily have arisen from a mistake in hearing than from one in copying. If this be so, we may imagine that one of John's students might have borrowed from a fellow a copy of the latter's notes, written them out for himself, and returned the original to its owner. If he then added to his copy material given by John orally, the resulting notes would probably contain mistakes both in copying and in hearing. That individual students would vary in the amount they could take down correctly is shown by the differences between the two versions of the commentary on Book IV, as we have seen in the foregoing section.

Sec. 5, pt. 3. The Present State of the Text

We have seen that there is little reason to hope that we shall ever possess a more complete form of John's commentary than that which our two manuscripts give us. It remains to see how far we may restore the actual words of John or of his hearers while accepting the limitations of the transmission.

The commentary has only once been published in full, being edited, in 1939, by Cora E. Lutz, under the auspices of the Medieval Academy of America. A few extracts had previously been published by Haugéau (*Notices et Extraits* XX, 2 (1862) 1-39), by Manitius (*Neues Archiv* XXXVI (1911) 57-60; *Didaskaleion* I (1912) 157-172; *ib.* II (1913) 43-62), and by Rand (*Johannus Scottus*, p. 81-82), but although all these scholars made some acute emendations, none made any serious attempt to purge the text of corruptions, with which, as I have already said, it abounds. Dr. Lutz then had an open field in which to distinguish herself. According to the reviewers of her edition (Professor Rand in *Speculum* 16 (1941), Professor Coulter in *American Historical Review* 46 (1941), and Mr. J. G. Sykes in *Classical Review* 54 (1940), she has done her job well. Unhappily these three reviewers are mistaken in their judgment. Dr. Lutz' edition is in fact the most unrelieved exhibition of incapacity which I have ever met in the editing of a Latin

text. The editor is woefully ignorant of the Latin language, of the subject-matter and of the source-material, is incapable of distinguishing sense from nonsense, and is unable to read accurately a plainly written manuscript. This judgment may seem drastic. I proceed to demonstrate the truth of each and every part.

Firstly there are many places in which the editor "emends" a sound reading into one which violates the rules of accidence or syntax. On p.70,1 of the edition the manuscript has " ... gravantur et torquentur animae ne redeant ad superiores sedes." Dr. Lutz emends redeant to reddeant. On p.135,5 the manuscript has "Procius pro procorum, id est petentium Philologiam. Mercurius enim et Apollo proci Philologiae sunt." Dr. Lutz emends to "PROCIUM pro procerum, id est petentium Philologiam. Mercurius enim et Apollo proceri Philologiae sunt." Yet Dr. Lutz does not need to make emendations in order to give proof of her Latinity. On p.159,8 there occurs in the manuscript the word bissextilis. Dr. Lutz prints this as "bis Sextilis", and takes it as meaning "the second of August". (Professor Coulter (Am.Hist.Rev. 46, p.110) shows incredible forbearance in refuting this error).

Secondly there are many examples of sentences which convey either nothing at all or something which could not have been said by any writer who had a grasp of his subject. On p.18 there is a

long gloss concerned largely with the theory of harmony. In the middle of it there is a reference to the harmonic relationship corresponding to an arithmetical ratio of 9:8 "Quoniam vero medii soni rationibus epogdois, quas octavas dicunt, ut sunt VIIII et VIII, sibimet coniunguntur, communis mensura mediarum vocum, quam dicunt totum, mox gignitur." That totum is a scribe's mistake for tonum would be at once understood by any-one who had read even one medieval treatise on music. It is not understood by Dr. Lutz. On p.44,16 a gloss on femineis (sc. numeris) reads "Femineis, id est paribus" in the manuscript. That odd numbers are male and even numbers female should be sufficiently well known. Dr. Lutz misreads the manuscript and prints "FEMINEIS id est partibus". On p.108,31 occurs a gloss which the manuscript exhibits as follows:- "Latialiter. Ideo hoc dicit quia rhetorica reperta est a philosophis grecorum locorum vero inventio unde argumenta rhetoricae artis ducuntur a marco tullio reperta est apud latinos." The expression locorum inventio is tolerably familiar to anyone who has a smattering of ancient rhetoric. Dr. Lutz punctuates:- "a philosophis Grecorum locorum, vero inventio ... etc".

That sense and nonsense are all one to our editor appears with sufficient clarity on p.181,28. The manuscript C reads:- Maior est ergo mensis lune quam civilis annus duobus diebus et IIII horis". It is impossible to read the eighth book of Martianus Capella without learning that the moon's year is the period of time in which

the moon performs a complete circle round the earth, returning to the same position in the zodiac, while a month is the period in which it returns to the same position relatively to the sun. If Martian's explanation is too difficult, one may turn to Macrobius' commentary on the "Somnium Scipionis" (book 2, c.12), where the same matter is perhaps more clearly set out. That Dr. Lutz should not have read either may be easily understood; but it is startling to find her emending sixis to solis, so that John may say that a month is two days and four hours longer than a year. The true reading gans is given by B. Indeed Dr. Lutz' astronomy is of a piece with her Latin, since in other parts of the text John is made to say that the moon is farther from the earth than the sun, and to attribute to Plato a cosmology in which only Saturn is geocentric (180,32; 22,34).

Dr. Lutz' skill in reading caroline minuscule has already been touched upon in the matter of partibus for the ms. paribus. In the expansion of contractions there are several errors to be noted. On 26,16 subdinus is read for subdinar (i.e. subdin²); on 25,24 the vox nihili solitas is a misreading of solitus es (i.e. solit⁹es); on 21,11 the meaningless dicunt is a wrong expansion of the common suspension dic. But it is by no means necessary for a word to be contracted in order that Dr. Lutz shall misread it. On p.11,13 mulla is a mistake for mullas; vanera (13,9) should be vaneri; existimat (18,26) is wrongly read for existimat.

That Dr. Lutz had only a limited acquaintance with the sources used by John may be inferred from the fact that she gives no source for the long gloss (p.4) on the syzygies of the elements, which comes from Isidore De Natura Rerum c.11 or Ambrose, Hexameron III,4 (which Isidore copies almost word-for-word), nor for the theory of the influence of the planets on human character (p.20, 1-5), which is taken from Isidore, op. laud. 3,4 or from Macrobius, Son. Scip. I,12. The note on φρην and phrenetici (p.204,9) passes without remark, although it is taken from Dionysius Exiguus, De Creatione Hominis c.12. Dr. Lutz does not indicate the source of the attribution to the laurel of the "vis verorum somniorum" (p.12,25; 24,32), which John takes from Fulgentius, Myth. I,13 and Lactantius Placidus on Thebaid I,509. Even so common an etymology as "ars dicta est ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς" (Isidore, Origines I 1,2; ib. I, 5,2; Servius on Aen. 3,270; Donatus on Andria I, 1,4; Cassiodorus, Inst. Lib. Litt. in Migne PL 70,1151C) might be assumed from Dr. Lutz' silence to be an original invention of John's. But I shall speak of the sources in greater detail in a later section.

It may easily be understood that in Dr. Lutz' hands the text receives very little purification. She does indeed take over a few emendations from Manitius and Haureau, but when one weighs against the few corrections of the manuscript text the great number of passages where corruptions have passed unnoticed, where corruptions

have been wrongly emended, where sound words have been emended into unsound, and where words in themselves satisfactory have been reduced to nonsense by defective punctuation, where the words of Martian have been represented as those of John and vice versa, it must be conceded that she has left the text more corrupt than she found it.

It is obvious then that a new edition of the commentary is required. The first step in preparing this edition must be a thorough collation of B and C. B's version of Book I should be printed as an appendix. The lemmata as given in these manuscripts should be carefully compared with those in Dick's manuscripts, not with those in his text, as Dr. Lutz has done. If Dick's manuscripts all agree against a reading in B or C, that reading should be rejected, unless it can be shewn to be essential to the sense of John's glosses. It goes without saying that no lemma should ever be emended to make it agree with a conjectural reading of a modern editor. The principles of emendation in the body of the glosses will be those generally recognized as valid for all Latin Texts. In the matter of spelling the best practice of John's contemporaries should be the model, unless John himself makes his own preferences clear, as he does in the case of retorica, condicionalis and cathexoria. As regards ae and a, the best course will be to follow classical spelling except in the case of a few words like gohara.

in which the misspelling was common to the whole period. The merely monstrous, such as Fililogia, habaet, sunare, dae are, huhic and the like, must of course be expunged. (In this connexion it is perhaps too much to hope that the learned world will ever again be permitted to talk of the Mythologiae of Fulgentius. Whether it will ever become de rigueur to talk of him as a late mitographer, and to find fault with his exposition of certain mits, I cannot tell. But to return to John.) The punctuation requires special attention. Apart from the problem of recognising where sentences or clauses end and where they begin, which should offer no difficulty to anyone with a sound grounding in grammar, the principal difficulty is to determine exactly how John linked his lemmata to his glosses. In many cases there are simple verbal glosses, where an easier equivalent to the lemma-word is given. Here a colon should be used, as Lindsay does in the editions of the glossaries. If the equivalent word is introduced by id est or hoc est (which would be better abbreviated to i.e. and h.e.), a comma should be used instead of the colon. Thus one would punctuate "Toris: humeris.", but "Toris, h.e. humeris". Where a lemma is followed by an independent sentence, the sentence should begin with a capital letter, and a full stop should be placed after the lemma. Thus 25,14 Dick "Arithmetica teste. Ideo hoc dicit .. etc." Where a lemma is an integral part of a sentence, it should not affect the punctuation of the sentence, but should merely be printed in whatever different

type has been adopted for lemmata. Thus 14,19 Dick, "Aimut enim solem veluti numen quoddam orbi complacito, h.e. hominibus bene viventibus et sibi placentibus ... etc", not "veluti numen quoddan, ORBI etc" as Dr. Lutz prints it. The punctuation of the glosses is a matter for individual preference. Dr. Lutz' text is under-punctuated: I should prefer to see a return to the old system, based on the punctuation of German, of separating off all subordinate clauses by commas, with colons and semicolons for the larger breaks. A refusal to punctuate seems only too often to mark an editor's unwillingness to commit himself. The lemmata should of course be printed in a different type from the glosses. Dr. Lutz uses a small upper-case, which distinguishes the two quite well, but looks rather clumsy. Italic type would perhaps be preferable. The critical apparatus should not be burdened with the trivialities which Dr. Lutz thought fit to record, which contribute nothing to the text-criticism.

As for the indication of the sources, that task can only be adequately discharged by the widest possible reading of the previous literature, particularly those authors whom Draeseke has listed as being John's chief authorities in the *De Divisione Naturae* (J. Draeseke, Johannes Scottus Eriugena und dessen Gelehrtenkinner in den Werke De Divisione Naturae, Leipzig 1902). When this work has been done, it will be at last possible to produce a useful edition of the commentary. Until then the world of medieval scholarship will have to be content, as indeed it seems to be, with an edition which is grossly defective in every department of an editor's duties.

Section 5, Part 4

The General Character of the Commentary of Johannes Scottus

In a later section I shall have occasion to speak of some characteristics of John's commentary as compared with that of Remigius. Accordingly I shall restrict myself here to the most general observations.

This commentary has attracted attention as exemplifying the literary, as opposed to the philosophical, interests of its author. Nevertheless it is apparent from the shortest inspection that the purpose is primarily philosophical, and that the literary aspect of Martian's work has no interest for John. That dismal saying of Augustine's, "displicet mihi, quod Musas quasi aliquas deas, quamvis jocando, commemoravi" might well have come from the lips of John, who is as unbalanced a fanatic as the bishop of Hippo himself. To John Martian is simply a mine from which his own peculiar doctrines can be quarried. Does he agree with what John takes to be orthodox Christianity, he is praised and applauded, he speaks truly, reasonably, "pulchre, merito, non irrationabiliter" (9,27; 8,7; 10,7): does he differ from this standard, or bring in some literary adornment, he is reproved, his words are the ravings of poets, deserve no explanation since they are false (17,34; 31,17). Yet not only the paganism of Martian earns condemnation, but also his errors in logic, as that science is understood or misunderstood by Johannes Scottus, who invests himself in

this matter with infallibility. "In hoc loco confundit duas categorias" says he, referring to the definition given by Martian (p.174, 11 seqq. Lick), "proprie enim relativas dicuntur, quae eodem modo sibi invicem respondent et verti possunt per eodem casus". This doctrine, which reduces the nature of relatives to a proposition in Latin grammar, he has taken from the Pseudo-Augustine, completely disregarding Boethius' version of the Categories.

The taste and temperament of the commentator are clearly shown in the proportion of space which he devotes to the various subjects. The allegorical part of Martian receives the most detailed treatment, as being that part which could most easily be interpreted as supporting John's cloudy metaphysic. Next comes dialectic, John's chosen field, as Dr. Lutz rightly observes (p. xciii), followed closely by the theoretical parts of the books on astronomy and geometry. Some interest was evidently taken in music, and some in rhetoric, although John's ignorance of the latter is profound. His painful attempts to enlighten his readers about Verres (p.117, 121) reveal clearly what he refuses to admit, that he had never met the name of Verres outside the pages of Martian. Another name unknown to him is that of the Horatius who slew his own sister. The reason for this action is not given by Martian: the mind trained in Christian theology swiftly leaps to a congenial explanation + "quia voluit concumbere

cum illo". In geography John's interest must have been limited by the defects of his knowledge. A few identifications are correct but in most places he gropes helplessly after etymologies (145,5; 145,19; 146,2.13.19.20). In grammar there is but little interest shown, and less knowledge. "bidental" is ignorantly explained as "furca", and "sinciput" as "senatus caput" (p.77), while "lien" is said to be a Sicilian name for Diana (p.73).

Clearly then the commentary of Johannes Scottus is very far from being a systematic treatment of the seven arts. Professor Rand declares (op.cit. p.509) that John found nothing alien in any of the arts: even were this catholicity of interest proven, the most ardent admirers of the Irish philosopher would need to admit that his learning was rather less catholic. In fact it seems to me that, apart from his knowledge of Greek, John was not one of the most learned men of his time, and was not competent to write a commentary upon so difficult a Latin text.

The defects in the substance of the commentary are not compensated by any striking beauty of form or language. The labours of a commentator rarely strive after felicity of expression, deeming it sufficient to be clear and grammatical. Johannes Scottus unfortunately, either in order to do justice to his subject, or because he cannot write otherwise, couches his commentary in that style of hideous prolixity which was so much affected by writers of the dark ages, and which even in the hands of the most

skilful executants, as in the Vita Benmonis, merely cloy where it does not revolt the taste. John's inferiority to Remigius in this matter I shall demonstrate in the appropriate place.

Lest I should seem to judge John too harshly, I must add that the defective transmission may misrepresent the actual teachings of John, since the most striking examples of ignorance are found in those parts where the notes are most sparse. In these places (according to Professor Rand) the class-room copyists will have been most slipshod in their work. Yet since the first book, whose authenticity is beyond all doubt, contains the highly individual cosmic system which John ascribes to Plato, while it is in fact the child of his own brain, I am prepared to believe that the mis-statements of the later books do not all proceed from the folly of scribes of school-boys.

For the present place then let this brief characterization suffice. In a later section the exegetical abilities of John will be compared with those of Remigius: here it is enough to have suggested that this commentary, which has been highly esteemed by several scholars, is to be considered as interesting rather than valuable.

Sec 5, pt 5 The Sources used by Johannes Scottus

In her introduction Dr. Lutz has listed the principal writers followed by John in his commentary on Martian (pp. xxx-xxv). There is not much to add to her concise statement, although she has not observed the use of the second Vatican mythographer and of Dionysius Exiguus, but in the detailed indication of sources for individual glosses there is much that may be filled in. I propose therefore to give a preliminary list of passages in the commentary of which I have traced the sources. (References are to page and line of Dr. Lutz's edition.)

3,32 membranula quae dividit inter ilia etc. Pliny, Nat. Hist.

XI, 37, 77, 197 - Exta homini ab inferiore viscerum parte separantur membrana, quae praecordia appellant, quia cordi praetenditur, quod Graeci appellaverunt σπερμάς . Dionysius Exiguus, De Creatione Hominis XII (PL 67, 362D) - Medicorum vero peritissimi utrisque lateribus, quibus eiusdem cerebri membranula continetur, aliqua passione turbatis, rationale nostrum aegrotans definiunt, appellantes freneticam passionem, quia lisdem membranulis frenes nomen existit.

4,2 a grecis hymen vocatur: inde Hymeneus etc. Servius ad Aen. IV, 99

- Est etiam alia ratio vocabuli (sc. Hymenei): nam

hymen quaedam membrana quasi virginalis puellae esse dicitur; qua

rupta, quia desinat esse virgo, Hymenaei nuptias dictas. (The earlier part of Servius' note is concerned with the story of the mythical Hymeneus).

4,3-28 Ambrose, Hexameron III,4. - Terra arida et frigida, aqua frigida atque humida, aer calidus atque humidus, ignis calidus atque siccus. Per has enim iugabiles qualitates sic sibi singula commiscuntur. Terra enim, cum sit arida et frigida, coniungitur aquae per cognitionem qualitatis frigidae. Rursus aqua aeri per unorem, quia unidus est aer. Aqua vero, quasi quibusdam duobus brachiis frigoris atque humoris, altero terram, altero aerem videtur complecti, frigido quidem terram, aerem humido. Ipse quoque aer medius inter duo repugnantia per naturam, h.e. inter aquam et ignem, utrumque illud elementum sibi conciliat, quia aquae humore et igni calore coniungitur. This passage is quoted at length by Isidore, De Natura Rerum II. The doctrine seems to be an elaboration of that implicit in Macrobius, Somnium Scipionis I, 6,24.

7,3 (aer) in cuius significatione Iuno ponitur Macrobius, Som. Scip. I,17 - Est autem Iuno aer. Cf. also Arnobius Adversus Gentes III,30

7,20 Cloto etc. Probably from Fulgentius, Myth. I,7.

7,26 Gradivus ... quasi gradus divus. Servius on Aen. III,35 - Gradivum .. is. exsiliensem in proelia, quod in bellantibus sit necesse est ... Alii Gradivum quod gradum inferant qui pugnant,

aut quod impigre gradientur ... Alii Gradivum quia nunquam equester:
aut a gradu dictum,

8,2 Ops .. in significatione terrae Servius on Aen. VI, 325 - ..

nam Ops terra est. Augustine, C.D. VII,24 - "tellurem" inquit
(ac. M. Varro) "putant esse Opem ..."

8,6 a filio suo Iove castratus. Fulgentius, Myth. I,2:- Macrobius
Sat. I, 7,21.

8.16 CYLLENTIUS vocatur Mercurius a Cylleno monte. Servius on Aen.
IV,252 - CYLLENTIUS aut ab avia .. aut a Cyllene, Arcadiae monte,
ubi dicitur esse nutritus.

8,31 mendax Grotia Perhaps a reminiscence of Juvenal, Sat. X, 174;
more probably of Fulgentius, Myth. I, prooemium - mendacis Graeciae
fabuloso commento.

9,18 Hermes. i.e. sermo. Isidore, Origines VIII, 11,25 - Ideo
et Ἑρμῆς Graece, quod sermo, vel interpretatio, quae ad sermonem
utique pertinet, ἐρμηνεία dicitur. Augustine, C.D. VII,6 gives the
same account, which John does not represent accurately.

12,15 lauream virgam etc. Fulgentius, Myth. I,13 - At vero amica
Apollinis ob hanc rem vocitata est (ac. laurus), quia illi, qui de
interpretatione somniorum scripserunt, ut Antiphon, Philocorus
et Artemon et Serapion Ascalonites, promittunt in suis libris,
laurum si dormientibus ad caput posueris, vera somnia esse visuros.

13,1 LEMNUS ... a Lemno insula. Servius on Aen. VIII, 454 -
LEMNUS quia in Lemnum insulam, ut diximus, cecidit.

13,3 in formula terram ignis. Augustine, C.D. VII, 16 Vulcanum
volunt ignem mundi.

13,19 AEROLITE i.e. sources etc. To the source cited by Dr. Lutz
may be added Fulgentius, Myth. II, 1 (p. 39, 14 Felsa) and Macrobius
Saturnalia I, 8, 6.

14,24 virtutibus animae quatuor eas sagittis vitiorum interizat
insidiatur. This seems to be a Christianised version of Servius
on Aen. I, 663 - Sagittas vero ideo gestare dicitur, (vel quia
amorem et libidinem sequitur punctura poenitentiae et dolor, vel)
quia, ut ipse, incertae velocesque sunt. The words bracketed are
expelled from the text by Thilo and Hagen, but are supported by
Hemigius; unless indeed they originate from him).

15,10 TALARIA a talo Isidore, Origines XIX, 34, 7 - Talares calcei
socci sunt, qui inde nominati videntur, quod ea figura sunt ut
contingant talia.

15,16 FANA etc. The etymology, although different, seems to have
been influenced by Isidore, Origines IV, 4, 6 - Fana dicta a Faunis,
quibus templa error gentilius construebant, unde consulentes
daemorum responsa audirent. John might conceivably have used
a manuscript reading fonis.

15,15 OBSCURIS AMBAGIBUS ... confusa. Virgil, Aen. VI, 96 - Talibus
ex adyto dictis Cumaea Sibylla Horrendas canit ambages, antroque
remigat, Obscuris vera involvens.

16,3 Erythraea vocata est ab Erythra insula. None of the ancient authorities (Lactantius, Div. Inst. I,6; Servius on Aen. VI,36; Isidore, Origines VIII, 8,4 who copies Lactantius) equates the Erythraean with the Cumaeen Sibyl. John's memory has probably failed him. To the sources cited by Dr. Lutz for the etymology of Sibylla may be added Servius on Aen. III,445; Lactantius, Div. Inst. I,6

16,24 DELOS ... Apollo. Servius on Aen. III,73 - Delos autem, quia diu latuit et post apparuit, nam δῆλον Graeci manifestum dicunt. Vel, quod verius est, quia cum ubique Apollinis responsa obscura sint, manifesta illic dantur oracula.

17,6 TRIPOS ... perhibetur. Lactantius Placidus on Thebaid I,509 - Tripos species est lauri, tres habens radices, Apollini consecrata propter triplicem vim divinationis. Fulgentius, Myth. I,13, quoted above on 12,15 Lutz.

19,28 PHOEBUS novus interpretatur etc. Isidore Origines VIII, 11,54 - Ipsum Phoebum quasi ephebum, hoc est adolescentem. Unde et sol puer pingitur, eo quod cotidie oriatur et nova luce nascatur.

19,29 AURICOMES ... propter pulcherrimum radiorum splendorem etc. Macrobius Saturn. I,17, - Apollo Chrysocomes cognominatur a fulgore radiorum, quas vocant comas aureas solis.

19,32 SAGITTARIUS dicitur Apollo quia radiis suis .. totum .. penetrat mundum. Macrobius, Saturn. I, 21,26 - Sagittarius .. quod indicat tunc quoque universorum constare vitam radio solis vel ab ima parte venientis.

20,1 nulla planetarum ... copulenta. Isidore, De Natura Rerum 3,4
 Proinde autem gentiles ex his septem stellis nomina diebus dederunt,
 eo quod per easdem aliquid sibi effici aestimarent, dicentes habere ex
 sole spiritum, ex luna corpus, ex Mercurio linguam et sapientiam,
 ex Venere voluptatem, ex Marte fervorem, ex Iove temperantiam, ex
 Saturno tarditatem. Macrobius, Som. Scip. I,12 - (anima a superiore
 parte mundi descendens) in singulis (sc. sphaeris) ... singulos motus
 quos in exercitio est habitura producit; in Saturni ratiocinationem
 et intelligentiam, ... in Iovis vim agendi ... in Martis animositatis
 ardorem, ... in Solis sentiendi opinandique naturam ... desiderii
 vero motum ... in Veneris ... interpretandi quae sentiat ... in
 orbe Mercurii; ... naturam plantandi et augendi corpora, ingressu
 globi lunaris exercet.

21,3 Electri ... duo genera sunt. To the source cited by Ir. Lutz may
 be added Isidore, Origines XVI, 24.

21,6 Aiunt astrologi etc. Pliny, N.H. II,21 etc.

21,26 per duodecim partes etc. Pliny, N.H. II,16.- Luna quoque per
 totam latitudinem eius (sc. signiferi) vagatur, omnino non excedens
 eum. The phrase "tortuoso draconum meatu", used here by John to
 describe the course of the moon, is a reminiscence of "flexuoso
 draconum meatu", applied by Pliny in the same passage to the course
 of the sun.

23,25 Mulcifer ... quasi vulcens ferrum. Festus s.v. (p. 144 Mueller)

Mulciber Vulcanus a molliendo scilicet ferro dictus; mulcere enim mollire sive lenire est.

24,32 vim vero(rum) somniorum. See passages cited above on p.17,6 Lutz.

25,28 insinuat ... demonstratio. Fortunatian, Art. Rhet. II, 14

(Halm p.109,13) - Quid est insinuat? subdolum principium, quo

occultius inreptus in animum iudicis. Victorinus I,15 (197,1

Halm) - "Exordium" inquit "in duo dividitur, in principium et

insinuationem." ... in principio aperte.. iudices .. benivolos

comparatus, in insinuatione vero occulte et quibusdam circumscriptionibus.

Id I,5 (174,46 Halm) - Demonstratio est, inquit, certae personae

aut laus aut vituperatio.

28,18 transitus personarum. Rufinian Schem.Lex 25 (54,7 Halm) -

μετάστασις est vel μετάβασις, cum a loquentis persona ad personam aliam transitum facimus, ratione aliqua vel adfectu...

Haec figura dicitur variatio aut transitus.

29,25 Solarium radiorum violentia etc. Isidore, Origines III,

66,3 - Quaedam sidera radiis solis praepedita anomala fiunt, aut

retrograda, aut stationaria. Pliny, N.H. II,16 - Percussae (sc.

planetae) in qua dixius parte, et triangulo solis radio inhibentur

rectum agere cursum et ignea vi levantur in sublime..Hoc uno pro-

ptinus intelligi potest visu nostro, ideoque existimantur stare,

unde et nomen accepit statio.

32,9 PROMUBA etc. Isidore, Origines IX, 7,4 - Promuba dicta eo quod

mubentibus praestet.

33,14 Hermaphroditum. Lactantius Placidus, Narrationes fabularum Lib. IV (p. 812 van Staveren) - Mercurius cum ex Venere, qui duplici figura Hermaphroditus vocatur, genuisset etc. Isidore, Origines XI, 3,11 - Alia (sc. monstra) conmixtione generis, ut ἀνδρόγυνοι et ἑρμαφροδίται vacantur. Hermaphroditae autem nuncupati eo quod eis uterque sexus appareat. Ἑρμῆς quippe apud Graecos masculus, ἄφροδίτη femina nuncupatur.

33,34 elephantinis ossibus ... qui barri vocantur. Isidore, Origines XII, 2,14 - Apud Indos autem a voce barro vocatur (sc. elephas). Cf. ib. XVI, 5,19.

35,35 ab avo materno Atlante. Virgil, Aen. IV, 258 - materno veniens ab avo Cyllenia proles. Servius ad loc. - MATERNO AB AVO. Per Maian, Atlantis filiam.

36,22 - 37,6 To the passage of Macrobius cited by Dr. Lutz may be added the following from Chalcidius (Comm. in Timaeum p. 102 Wrobel) - Etenim duo duplicati pariunt quattuor numerum, tria nullo duplicato nascuntur, ipsa autem duplicata pariunt senarium numerum. Quattuor numerus et paritur et parit; paritur quidem a bis duobus, parit autem duplicatus octonarium numerum. Rursum quinque numerus a nullo nascitur bis supputato, ipse autem bis supputatus parit decem. Item sex numerus nascitur quidem ex duplicato triente, parit autem infra decimanum limitem neminem. Octavus nascitur ex bis supputatis quattuor, ipse autem neminem

parit; decimus nascitur ex duplicato numero quinque, ipse porro neminem parit. Itaque omnibus partim nascentibus, partim parientibus, solus septenarius numerus neque ex duplicatione alterius nascitur nec infra decemarium limitem parit quemquam, proptereaue Minerva est a veteribus cognominatus, item ut illa sine matre perpetuoque virgo.

38,16 quinque paralleli. Cf. Isidore, De Rerum Natura 10,2

39,17 CONSENSUS consiliorum deus Paulus-Festus s.v. Consualia - Consualia ludi dicebantur quos in honorem Consi faciebant, quem deum consilii putabant. Mythographus Vaticanus Primus I,191 - Consensus deus est consiliorum, qui ideo templum sub tecto habuit ut ostendatur tectum esse debere consilium ... etc. The mythographer copies word for word from Servius on Aen. VIII,636.

42,3 Thaumasias ... pulchritudinem. Mythographus Vaticanus Secundus II,6 - Iris autem, Iunonis ministra, secundum poetas Thaumasias dicta est, nempe Thaumantis filia. Ceterum ex admiratione hoc nomen accepit, quae admiratio ex eius nascitur coloribus.

43,16 Cauda anni ... consumit. The crass stupidity of this note seems not to have been observed by John's admirers. The head of the snake eats the tail, not the tail the head. John may be confusedly recalling Servius on Aen. V,85 - Annus enim secundum Aegyptios indicabatur ante inventas litteras picto dracone, candam suam mordente, quia in se recubitat.

43,29 ex Saturno et Terra deos esse natos. Servius on Geo. IV,64 -

... terra, quae est mater deorum. Augustine, C.D. VI,8 - Si autem interpretationis huius, quando agitur de sacris Matris deum, caput est certe quod mater deum terra est, quid ultra quaerimus?

44,6 quibus vaporibus ... nutriuntur sidera. Isidore, Origines,

III,49 - Cuius (sc. solis) ignem dicunt philosophi aqua nutrir.

Servius on Aen. I,607 - Pasci autem aquis marinis sidera, i.e.

ignes caelestes, physici docent, secundum quos Lucanus ait: Atque undae plus quam quod digerat aer. Quidam radios solis pasci asserunt umore terreno.

44,26 globosa sunt instar sphaerarum. Martian 814 Kep-Mundus igitur

ex quattuor elementis isdemque totis in sphaerae modum globatis

(globatur Dick). Cf. Bede, De Rerum Natura c.3. - Mundus est

universitas omnis quae constat ex caelo et terra, quattuor elementis in speciem orbis absoluti globata.

45,25 IASPIS An account of this stone is given by Isidore, Origines XVI, 7,8.

46,32 brattea. Isidore, Origines XVI, 18,2 - Brattea dicitur tenuissima lamina (sc. auri).

47,29 pyropeus. John's definition of "pyropeus" seems to be his own: it runs quite counter to Pliny's description (N.H. XXXIV, 20,1).

48,18 Thetis siquidem inferior pars Oceani dicitur. Augustine

C.D. VII,22 - Iam utique habebat Salaciam XXXX Neptunus uxorem,

quam inferiorem aquam maris esse dixerunt. Servius on Geo. I,31 -
Hanc Tethyn Cicero in Timaeo Salaciam dicit.

48,34 Proserpina dicitur quasi proserpens. The same etymology is
given by Isidore, Origines VIII, 11,60 and Augustine, C.D. VII, 20 and 24.

49,28 Busia Gen. Servius on Aen. VIII,300.

50,22 ignis accommodatus in usus hominum. Augustine C.D. VII,16 -

Vestam quoque ipsam propterea deorum maximam putaverunt, quod
ipsa sit terra: quamvis ignem mundi leviozem, qui pertinet ad usus
hominum faciles, non violentiorem qualis Vulcani est, ei deputandum
esse crediderunt.

53,13 dominus negotiantium. Fulgentius, Myth. I,18 - Mercurium
dici voluere quasi mercium curum. Cf. also Festus s.v. Mercurius;
Isidore, Origines VIII, 11,45; Servius on Aeneid IV, 638.

55,12 qui etiam Arctofilax. Servius on Geo. I,67 - Arcturus autem
idem Arctophylax. Isidore, Origines III, 71,8 - Arctophylax dictus,
quod Arcton, id est Helicem Ursam, sequitur. Eundem et Looten
dixerunt ... etc.

58,32 a lapide quem devoravit. Augustine, C.D. VII,9 - .. sicut
Saturno dicitur suppositus lapis, quem pro filio devoraret.
Servius tells the story in detail on Aen. III, 104, VII,322,
Geo. IV,153. I cannot imagine why John makes this astounding
identification.

61,18 mandax Grogia. See above on 8,32 Lutz.

61,20 The removal of Cyrrha to India seems to be John's own invention. Isidore expressly locates it in Thessaly (Origines XII, 8,11).

62,16 Syrma prolixa sententia. A guess from the context. A gloss quoted by Luncker, I know not from where, says "Syrma polysemos est sermo. Dicitur et longa sententia." (Mythographi Latini 1742, p.603).

63,4 Vocatur Hermes Mercurius. See above on p.9,18 Lutz.

65,8 imoutribilis est. Pliny N.H. XIII, 27,1 - ... libros citratos fuisse : Propterea arbitrari tineas non tetigisse.

65,9 species tenuissima lini. Pliny, N.H. XIX 2,4 - Et Hispania citerior habet splendorem lini praecipuum torrentis in quo politur natura, qui alluit Tarraconem. Et tenuitas mira, ibi primum carbasis repertis. See Salmasius, Exercitationes Plinianas p.668,B b on confusion of citrus and cedrus.

65,10 de cuius libro faciebant primo veteres libros. Cassiodorus, Lib. Istit. praef. (PL 70,1151B) - Liber autem dictus est a libro, id est arboris cortice dempto atque liberato, ubi ante copiam chartarum antiqui carmina describebant. Cf. also Pliny, N.H. XIII, 21,1.

65,16 ADYTA ... quod vix adiri possunt. Servius on Aen. II,115 - Adytus est locus templi secretior, ad quem nulli est aditus nisi sacerdoti, ab ᾱ sine et δέω ingredior, id est, sine alicuius ingressu. Id. II,404 - non enim accedunt ad adyta nisi religiosi sacerdotes.

65,22 ars dicta est ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς . hoc est a virtute.

Servius on Aen. V,270 - ARTE, id est virtute; quod Graece ἀρετή dicitur. Isidore, Origines I, 1,2 - Alii dicunt a Graecis hoc tractum esse vocabulum ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς , id est a virtute. Cf. Cassiodorus, Lib. Litt. praef. (PL 70,1151C), which appears to be the immediate source for Isidore.

65,28 PAGINULAE etc. Boethius de musica IV,16 - hae paginulae, quas inter se rectus linearum ordo distinguit, aliae quidem habent notulas musicas, aliae vero minime, velut in eo modo qui scribitur hypermixolydian etc.

67,16 februo purgo. Paulus-Festus s.v. Februarius - Februarius mensis dictus quod tum, i.e. extremo mense anni, populus februaretur, i.e. lustraretur et purgaretur ... Quaecumque denique purgamenti causa in quibusque sacrificiis adhibentur, februa appellantur. Ad vero quod purgatur, dicitur februatum.

67,19 Saturnus liberat mares de nuptiis. This seems to be a confused recollection of Augustine, C.D. VII,3 - Confert enim selectus Ianus aditum et quasi ianuam semini; confert selectus Saturnus semen ipsum: confert selectus Liber eiusdem seminis emissionem viris ... Saturnus seminis dator vel sator, et Liber et Libera seminum commotores vel emissores ... etc.

68,7 prodigia dicuntur quasi porro dicentia. Cassiodorus, Expositio in Psalterium. CCCXXXIV,9 - Prodigia quasi porro digia, id est longe praedicentia. Isidore, Origines XI, 3,3 - Prodigia, quod

porro dicant. Festus s.v. Prodigia - prodigia quod praedicunt futura. John's interpretation of porro as aperte in this etymology seems to be original.

68,24 HERCULES etc. The fable may very well come from Hyginus 29, but "Alcus qui etiam Alcmenes" is a stranger to me.

69,20 See above on Lutz 16,5.

69,24 Ereos terrani. ab Era. terra. Servius on Ecl. IV,35 - HEROAS. Quidam a terra dictos volunt, quod terra ἔρα dicta sit, unde initio nati creduntur homines, qui nomen a matre traxerunt.

70,3 φλόξ flamma. inde PYR. PLEGETONTA. Servius on Aen. VI,265 - Per Phlegethonta, inferorum fluvium, ignem significat; nam πῦρ Graece, Latine ignis est.

70,15 Eleusina, queen of Greece, seems not to occur in the standard mythological sources.

71,3 Absis Mercurii in Virgine. I cannot trace John's authority for this view. Pliny (N.H.II, 13,3) says that Mercury has his "absis" in Capricorn.

72,9 temperantur calore solis. Isidore, Origines III,61 - Stellas non habere proprium lumen, sed a sole illuminari dicuntur, sicut et luna (So Lindsay: a misprint for stellae?)

72,15 maximum idolum Aegyptiorum. Macrobius Saturn. I,20 - Serapis, quem Aegyptii deum maximum prodiderunt ..

73,12 commissuras absidum. Pliny, N.H. II, 16,1 - commissurae absidum extremaeque orbitae atram in obscuritatem (sc. vertunt colores).

75,29 Pemula vestis tenuissima de serico. This blunder is probably a piece of unsuccessful guessing on John's part. I can find no authority for his definition.

75,30 Omnes philosophi .. pallium portant. Cf. Aulus Gellius, Noct. Att. IX,2 - Video, inquit barbam et pallium, philosophum nondum video. Tertullian De Pallio passim.

76,1 anchiridion. Isidore, Origines IV, 11,1 - Enchiridion dictum quod mano adstringatur, dum plurima contineat ferramenta.

76,3 phlebotomum. Isidore, loc. laud. - Phlebotomum ab incisione vocatum, nam incisio Graece τομή dicitur.

76, 13 GHOMI. Isidore, Origines XVII 7,70.

76,28 Litteratio. Augustine, De Ordine II,12 - illa librariorum et calculorum professio, velut quaedam grammaticae infantia, quam Varro litterationem vocat. Isidore, Origines I,31 Quarum (sc. litterarum) disciplina velut quaedam grammaticae infantia est; unde et eam Varro litterationem vocat.

77,18 SIL legumen. Pliny N.H. XX,18 passim.

77,26 senatus caput. This impudent etymology shews (if the text is sound) a disregard of Velius Longus and Pliny N.H. VIII, 77,5.

Apparently John is simply making wild guesses at the meaning of words which he has never met elsewhere.

78,18 UNIO herba. This meaning of unio seems only to occur in Columella XII, 10.

79,5 FLEMIN est ulcus in cruribus. Cf. Caper, p.2243 P.(p. Keil)
- Flemina sunt, ubi abundant crura sanguine.

79,14 FEMUS et femur et femen. Cf. Priscian de Accent. p.1293 P.
(p. Keil).

90,10 Iovis nihil aliud est nisi mundus. Augustine, C.D. VII,16
... secundum eos (sc. paganos) totus ipse mundus est Iovis est.

90,12 Delius. See above on Intz p. 16,24.

90,25 immortalis interpretatur. Fulgentius Myth. II,1 - Athene
Graece dicitur quasi athanate parthene, id est immortalis virgo.

91,27 perrexit Aegyptum. Cicero, De Finibus V, 29,87 - Cur Plato
Aegyptum peragravit, ut a sacerdotibus barbaris numeros et caelestia
acciperet? Cur post Tarentum ad Archytam? Cur ad ceteros Pythagoreos ...?
Cf. Diog. Laertius Vita Platonis 6. There is probably a more immediate
source, but I have not found it.

98,17 relativa dicuntur quae eodem modo sibi invicem respondent
et verti possunt per eodem casus. This is an unusual restriction
of the meaning of relativum. Boethius explicitly differs in his
commentary on the Categories. The only authority seems to be Pseudo-
Augustine, Categ. col.1431 Migne - Inset autem hinc categoriae et
soli et omni, ut inter coniuncta duo, quae ex se pendeant, sit
alterna conversio, quae Graece dicitur ut duplum simpli dicitur et

simplum dupli, et servus domini et dominus servi .. At quod vere ad aliquid dicitur, converti per vices potest, ut superius diximus .. Nevertheless, I feel that John has simplified and misrepresented his source.

105,26 Due sunt membranulae. Dionysius Exiguus as cited above on Lutz p.3,32.

108,8 liquida. potabilis. fecunda. Fulgentius, Myth. I,3 - Tridentem vero ob hanc rem ferre pingitur (sc. Neptunus), quod aquarum natura triplici virtute fungatur, id est liquida, fecunda, potabili.

108,11 Gladius. Servius as cited above on p.7,26, Lutz.

108,11 gladium bis acutum. Isidore, Origines XVIII, 6,3 - Franea vero gladius ex utraque parte acutus, quam vulgo spatam vocant.

109,9 GYMNASIUM Isidore, Origines, XV, 2,30 - Gymnasium generalis est exercitiorum locus. Tamen apud Athenas locus erat ubi discebatur philosophia ...

109,10 THEATRUM. Isidore, Origines XVIII, 42,1 - Theatrum autem ab spectaculo nominatum, ἀπὸ τῆς θεωρίας quod in eo populus... ludos scenicos contemplaretur.

110,2 Graecis enim lingua etc. The list of dialects may well come from Isidore, Origines IX, 1,4.

110,5 To the source cited by Dr. Lutz, which John is almost certain never to have read, may be added Victorinus, p.258,37 Halm. John may of course have derived his information from the Penlos Theophrasti, whatever that was.

111,18 Hypothesin non esse quaestionem. Augustine, Rhet. 5 passim.

117,1-4 This gloss at least gives us the negative information that John had never read the Verrines.

108,33 Culeus etc. The account given by John differs markedly from those of Modestinus, Isidore, etc., who all stress the inclusion of ape, cock and serpent. The detailed nature of the account suggests that John is describing some legal punishment familiar to his own day.

126,21 historia est rerum gestarum antiquo tempore commemoratio.

Victorinus p.202,26 Halm - "historia est" inquit "quae res veras continet, sed a nostra memoria remotas".

132,20 a Graecis dicitur Φωσφόρος. Isidore Origines XV, 2,37 ..

Unde et Lucifer Graece Φωσφόρος appellatur. Cf. 16 XX, 10,10.

133,14 Noctua dicitur nyctiorax. Isidore, Origines, XII, 7,40

Nycticorax ipse est noctua, quia noctem amat. The identification is wrong according to Porcellini.

133,26 Athene quasi athentate. Fulgentius as cited above on Lutz p.90,25.

135,1 quasi mulcens ferrum. Festus s.v. Mulciber, as cited above on Lutz p.23,25.

136 CREMIDAS calciamenta. Isidore Origines XII, 34,2

139,2 fecerunt orologium ita. With the whole passage compare

Macrobius Som. Scip. I,21 - Duobus igitur vasis aeneis praeparatis, quorum alteri fundus erat in modum clepsydrae foratus, illud quod

erat integrum, vacuum adiecerunt, pleno aquae altero superposito, sed meatu ante munito, et quamlibet de infixis clarissimam stellam incideque notabilem orientem observaverunt ... etc.

146,15 PSILLI incantatores serpentium. Solinus c.27 (p.383 Salm.)

Pliny N.H. VII,2,2 etc.

150,22 dicitur a Boetio curta. Boethius, de Arithmetica II,24

sin autem, a qualibet basi profecta, usque ad unitatem ~~non~~pe altitudo illa non venerit, curta vocabitur (sc. pyramis)

154,32 habentem C capita The number of the Hydra's heads is discussed by Servius on Aen VII, 658.

156,29 Lucina Diana. Proserpina. Servius on Aen. IV,511 - cum super terras est, Creditur esse Luna; cum in terris, Diana; cum sub terris, Proserpina.

157,27 infantia meritia etc. Servius on Aen. V,295 - aetates omnes Varro sic dividit; infantiam, pueritiam, adolescentiam, iuventutem, senectam.

159,17 quasi cidos bebeon. Fulgentius Myth. III,5 - Ut Sosicles Atticus in libro teleologumenon quem appellavit scribit, matrem deum in modum potentiae voluit poni, unde et Gibebe dicitur quasi cidos bebeon, id est gloriae firmitas.

166,3 ἐν οὐρανῷ, id est caelo, id est palato oris. Augustine C.D. VII,8 - hiatus noster, cum os aperimus, mundo similis videtur; unde et palatum Graeci οὐρανόν appellant: et nonnulli, inquit, poetae Latini caelum vocaverunt palatum. Isidore, Origines XI, 1,55

Palatum nostrum sicut caelum est positum, et inde palatum a polo per derivationem(1). Sed et Graeci similiter palatum ~~supra~~ appellant ... etc.

166,26 Silicernium quasi silicem cernens. Fulgentius, Sermones Antiqui 8 (p.114 Helm) - Silicernios dici voluerunt senes iam incurvos, quasi iam sepulchrorum suorum silices cernent s.

167,5 Quem Metellus in Sicilia superavit. Virgil, Aen. V, 362-472. The limits of Dr. Lutz' reading are surprisingly narrow.

168,20 Arctofilax vocatur. See the passages cited above on Lutz 55,12.

171,13 φύω nascor, inde φύσις natura. Isidore, Origines VIII, 6,4 - Physici dicit, quia de naturis tractant. Natura quippe Graece φύσις vocatur.

178,3 id est ^bdeambulantium. Isidore, Origines VII, 6,13 - Peripatetici a deambulatione dicti, eo quod Aristoteles auctor eorum deambulans disputare solitus esset.

186,27 interpretatur bona vox. Fulgentius Myth. I,15 - nona Caliope, id est optimae vocis ...

187,7 ANICITER pulcens ferrus. Festus as cited above on Lutz p.23,25.

188,20 id est Sortis. Fulgentius, Myth. I,8 - Lacesis vero sors nuncupatur.

199,17 nympharum deformitatem Panos suzientem. Lactantius Placidus, Enarr. Fab. I,12.

203,23 Pelta est scutum quadratum. John neglects the description of pelta given by Isidore (Origines XVIII, 12,4) probably he is inventing this description in order to fit what he imagines to be the sense of the passage.

203,29 Nenias etc. This is probably from Festus s.v. nenia, corrupted by a defective memory.

214,11 'Immortale nihil mundi comage tenetur'. This verse of Juvenius is cited by Bede (De Metris 12, col. 164C) to illustrate the same point.

Section 6. The Commentary of Remigius of AuxerrePart 1. The Manuscripts

Unlike the commentaries which we have hitherto considered, the commentary of Remigius is found not merely in one or two manuscripts, but appears either complete or in part in perhaps forty manuscripts, of which several are very old. Unhappily the manuscripts of Remigius have never been fully listed, nor has the relative value of them been assessed. The manuscript which has been generally considered the best, simply on the ground of its antiquity, namely Paris lat. 12960, is in fact exceedingly corrupt: that which seems to me to give the best text (B.M. Royal 15A XXXIII), is so far from being acknowledged, that it has even been thought to be the work of Dunchad, and has scarcely yet shaken off the imputation of being a "codex interpolatus".

The manuscripts were first listed by F. Narducci (Bollettino di Bibliografia e di Storia delle Scienze Matematiche e Fisiche 15 (1883) p.572 ff.), further manuscripts being added by M. Esposito (Classical Quarterly 13 (1919) p. 169). That some further manuscripts of Remigius' commentary exist, is hardly to be doubted: it is nevertheless most unlikely that our knowledge of the text would be improved by any fresh discovery and the most necessary step now is to assess the value of those which are known.

In this latter respect but little work has been done, and that which has been is exceedingly defective. In general each writer on Remigius has contented himself with making extracts from whichever manuscript happened to be nearest to hand. This Narducci published part of Book VII from Vat. Reg. Christ. 1970, Manitius used Dresden Dc. 180, Laistner used B.M. 15A XXXIII. While attempting to follow the nobler course of quoting from the best, instead of the nearest manuscript, Manitius succeeded only in bedevilling the text-criticism of this commentary and doing a great injustice to Remigius; since it was the fragmentary and corrupt manuscript Paris lat. 12960 which received the stamp of his approval as the "Älteste Ueberlieferung".

A further misfortune to students of Remigius was the exchange of opinions between M. Esposito and R. Flower in *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* VII, VIII and IX. In VII, 499-506, Esposito described the Royal manuscript in some detail, ascribing it to Dunchad, whose name appears in the superscription of f.3a. Replying in the next volume Mr. Robin Flower pointed out that f.3a had no connection with the rest of the manuscript, and that the commentary was in fact the work of Remigius. Mr. Esposito's reply took the form of stressing as highly as possible the differences between the text of this manuscript and that of the other known manuscripts. That Mr. Flower had been right in the trifling matter of the authorship of a commentary of 235 folios was passed over in one grudging sentence,

while the remainder of the article was devoted to an attempt to prove the detested adversary wrong in every other respect. This display of controversial spirit does not in itself deserve notice, were it not that Esposito's refusal to admit defeat has started another philological hare, which is still apparently in full career. Professor Laistner observes circumspectly (Bull. J. Ryl. Lib. 7 (1925) p.131) - "The evidence of the British Museum MS. Royal 15A XXXIII, as Esposito has already pointed out, is to the effect that there was no single version, but that additions were made to the commentary; whether by Remigius himself, or by his immediate pupils and successors, must remain doubtful for the present". With less caution Dr. Klibansky (Medieval and Renaissance Studies I (1943) p.182 n.) roundly avers - "That there are different redactions appears even from a cursory comparison of the manuscripts."

Concordia parvae res crescunt. I am sorry that I cannot find evidence for this multiplicity of redactions. I know not how cursory Dr. Klibansky's comparison of the manuscripts may have been: in the article from which I quote he cites from only one, which Dr. Flower copied for him. I have examined eleven, six of them in detail, and have found no proof of this Proteanism in Remigius' commentary; from which I suspect that Dr. Klibansky's comparison may have been somewhat too cursory, if indeed it was ever made.

So far I have examined the following manuscripts:-

- (1) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 12960
- (2) " " " " 8674
- (3) " " " " 8786
- (4) " " " n^{da}. 340
- (5) Bibliothèque d'Avranches 240
- (6) Biblioteca Laurenziana plut. 51,18
- (7) " " " 90, sup.19.
- (8) Bodleian Library Canon. Misc. 18.
- (9) Leyden Perizonianus C.2
- (10) Marton College 291
- (11) British Museum Royal XV A XXXIII

In these manuscripts I have compared the texts of the first and second books (the most popular part of the work), and I find (a) that nos. 1, 4, 5, 8, 10 are simply different manuscripts of the same work; (b) that no. 2 contains some worthless and obvious interpolation; (c) that nos. 3, 9 and 11 agree in having an additional introduction employing the formula of the "septem circumstantiae"; (d) that no. 6 is apparently a rough copy made by a very early humanist for his own use, with some material of different origin by way of a general introduction to Martianus Capella. So far as my research goes, from the point where the commentary itself begins (i.e. Titulus iste quattuor nomina dat suo auctori) there are no variations between the manuscripts except what may be ascribed to the errors of individual

scribes. It is at the most conceivable that Remigius himself, late in life, dictated a definitive version, to which he affixed an additional introduction. Beyond this admission there seems to be no support for the postulation of a multiplicity of recensions.

The manuscripts may thus be divided into two families. The first comprises B.M. Royal 15A XXVIII, B.N. lat. 8736 and Leyden Perizon. 2.2. The first of these I shall refer to as R (i.e. Remensis). The second class comprises all the other manuscripts which I have inspected. I shall give first a brief description of the manuscripts in turn, and then treat more discursively of the text offered by each.

Class I

R is a manuscript of 239 folios, written in single column, 27 lines to a page, in several hands of the tenth century. (Mr. Esposito finds two different hands, Professor Laistner four.) Folios 1 and 2 contain only scribblings and liturgical scraps. Folio 3a contains some astronomical notes, fol. 3b (from 1.5 onwards) a medical receipt. On f.4a begins the commentary of Remigius upon Martianus Capella. The title is "IN MARTIANI MINORI FELICIS CAPELLAE NOVENA PAUCA INCIPIUNT". Incipit:- Primo est transeundum per septem periochas. In the lower margin of f.4a is written in rustic capitals LIBER SANCTI REMIGII STUDIO GEFARDI. The manuscript was acquired by Thayer from Worcester Cathedral. Its previous history is unknown.

B.N. lat. 8786 is written in single column, 29 lines to a page, in a hand or hands of the early twelfth or late eleventh century. The commentary begins on f.1a. The title is identical with that of R. Incipit:- Primo est transeundum per septem periochas. There is no indication of provenance.

Levian Perizonianus C.2 is a manuscript of 207 folios, of 38 lines to a page, written in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century. From f.1a to 109a it contains the commentary of Remigius upon the whole of Martianus Capella. In a smaller and later hand in the margins of the text of Remigius is written what appears to be a voluminous glossary partly of Scriptural names.

Class II

Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 12960 is a manuscript of diverse contents containing from f.39a to 46b part of Remigius' commentary on the first book of Martianus, written in single column, 32 lines to a page, in a hand of the late ninth century, according to Manitius: Professor Laistner assigns it to the tenth century. The pages are very square, with long lines of writing running to about 85 letters per line. The title is "HINC MARTIANICE CAPIUNT EXORDIA GLOSSE". The manuscript came from Corbie, but the origin of the part containing Remigius is unknown.

Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 8674 is a manuscript of 114 folios written in single column, 42 lines to a page, in a small hand of the eleventh century. Starting from f.1a it contains the commentary of Remigius

upon the greater part of Martianus Cap 11a. (The B.M. cataloguers do not say how much: from the space occupied by Books I and 2, I estimate about the first five books.) The title is "INCIPIUNT GLOSSAE MAGISTRI REMIGII. MARTIANI MINEI FELICIS CAPELLAE LIBER I INCIPIT DE NUPTIIS MERCURII ET PHILOGIAE". There is no indication of provenance.

Bibliothèque d'Avranches 240 is a manuscript of 101 folios, written in single column, 43 lines to a page, written in a small and neat hand of the late tenth or early eleventh century. In very many places the reading of the first hand has been erased and corrected by an almost contemporary hand, from which it appears that the manuscript was copied from a very corrupt text and emended from a good one. The commentary of Remigius begins upon f.17a, and covers only the first five books. The title was INCIPIT COMMENTUM IN LIBRO MARCIANI MINEI FELICIS CAPELLAE, to which the word "remigii" has been added in a much later hand. The incipit is "Titulus iste quattuor nomina dat suo auctori".

Bodleian Library Canon. Misc. 18 is a manuscript in small quarto of 39 folios, written in single column of 37 lines to a page in a rather square and ugly hand of the late eleventh century. It contains from f.1a to 38b the commentary of Remigius upon the first two books of Martianus Capella. There are several examples of insular contractions. There is no title of any kind. The provenance

of the manuscript is not known, except that a note on 39b says "Emi duobus ducatis": nevertheless the writing appears more German than Italian.

Florence. Biblioteca Laurenziana Plut. 51.18 is a manuscript of 58 folios, written in single column, 22 lines to a page, in an apparently humanistic hand of the fifteenth century. The commentary of Remigius, beginning on f.2b, is preceded by some extraneous material, apparently worthless, since the writer says that Martian imitated his contemporaries Socrates and Epimenides! Bandini says that the commentary covers all nine books: if so, it must be greatly abridged in the later sections.

Biblioteca Laurenziana Plut. 90 sup.19 is a manuscript of 82 folios, written in single column, 40 lines to a page, in a small hand of the late tenth or early eleventh century. The part containing the superscription is damaged, but one can easily read:- INCIPUNT GLOSSE MAGISTRI REMIGII IN MARTIANO: MARTIANI MINEI FELICIS LIBER I INCIPIT DE NUPTIIS MERCURII ET PHILOGIE. There is no indication of provenance.

Merton College 291 is a large and handsome manuscript of 96 folios, written in England in the twelfth century. It contains the text of Martian books 1 and 2, breaking off at 71,15 Dick and resuming at 310,3 Dick (in Book 6), with the commentary of Remigius written in a very small hand in the four margins. The text is in single column of 28 lines to a page; the commentary varies in its number

of lines, since the scribe has had difficulty in getting his commentary to match up with the text. In some places the margins are left blank, the glosses having outrun the text. According to the custom of magnificent codices, it gives a poor text.

Bibliothèque Nationale. fonds lat. nouv. acq. 340 is a manuscript of 132 folios, written in double column, 37 lines to a column, in a small neat hand of the late tenth or early eleventh century. The title is simply "EXPOSITIO MARTIANI INCIPIT". The text begins "Titulus iste quattuor nomina dat auctori suo". The manuscript came from Cluni.

These then are the manuscripts which I have studied. Their importance for the text is not easy to assess. The first step is of course to discover which manuscripts can be dispensed with as being copied directly from another known manuscript. Only one, I think, can be proved to have been thus copied, although I suspect another as well. The following passages will shew that B.N. lat. 8786 is an apograph of R.

(1) The superscription is exactly the same in each case,
viz. IN LIBRIS MARTIANI MINEI FELICIS CAPELLE NOVEN PAUCA INCIPUNT.

(2) The text, so far as I have collated the two, shews the most perfect correspondence.

(3) R.44b reads:- "Purpureum pro pulchro ponitur, sicut Oratius, 'Purpureis ales oloribus'." The word "oloribus" happens

to begin a line, giving some medieval metrician the opportunity to insert a 'c', thus making "coloribus". B.N. 8786 reads "Purpureis ales coloribus", a reading not found in any other manuscript which I have inspected.

(4) R 17a reads:- "Suggestus dicitur proprie sella regalis, quia rege in eo residente suggerit ei aliquid minister". The words "aliquid minister" are found in the margin, added by a contemporary hand. An erasure above the "t" of "suggerit" suggests that the original reading was "suggeritur". B.N. 8786 has only the corrected reading "suggerit ei aliquid minister". In this case however the same reading is found in other manuscripts (e.g. nouv. acq. 340 and Avranches 240).

(5) In R there is an abortive attempt to write lemmata in capitals, which breaks down after f.6b. The scribe of B.N. 8786 does not try to write lemmata in capitals, except for the one lemma "nictantis" (Dick 4,10), which appears in majuscule on f.2b, line 22. There seems no reason for his doing so except that the same lemma is written in majuscule also in R (f.6b).

Perizonianus Q.2 I have not fully examined, but I suspect that it is an apograph of R or of B.N. 8786. If so, we may regard this entire family as springing from R.

The second family presents a quite different picture. None of the manuscripts which I have examined is an apograph of any other, and in two cases where I suspect a common archetype I am

well aware of the doubtful nature of the evidence. The only practical course then is to describe the text offered by each separate manuscript.

The most corrupt of all is Paris lat 12960. No more striking proof of the fallibility of mere antiquity as an index to the credibility of a manuscript could be imagined than the monstrous corruptions of this, the oldest existing text. I append some examples to show how its readings can be corrected from R.

G.39b1. M. Pugnania: propagare quaerentia perfectus suorum eventum.

R. 4b16. Pugnania, i.e. propagari quaerentia per foetus suorum proventum.

G.39b8. Ignis enim caliditas cum terra frigiditate coniungitur in siccitate.

R.4b25. Ignis enim caliditas cum terrena frigiditate ... etc.

G.40a28. ... liber apud Grecos de apototesia

R.6b25. ... liber apud Grecos de apothoesia

G.43b25. Clotto evacuatio.

R.7b13. Chloto evocatio.

G.41a24. Palnestragi, i.e. luctatio.

R.8b3. Palestra Grece luctatio.

G.41a26. Semper cum sole graditur (sc. Mercurius), nunquam ab eo amplius XXX passibus distans.

R.8b7. Semper cum sole graditur, nunquam ab eo amplius XXX partibus distans.

C.39b27. Et nota tria quae dicuntur, sexum, amorem et fidem. His enim tribus stabilitur omne regnum.

R.6a2 Et nota tria quae dicit, sexum, amorem et fidem. His enim tribus stabilitur omne coniugium.

C.39a15. Mercurius dictus est quasi medius currens, quia sermo maxime inter mercatores viget.

R.4b15. Mercurius dictus est quasi medius currens, quia sermo inter duos seritur; vel quasi mercatorum kyrios, i.e. dominus, quia sermo maxime inter mercatores viget. (See Rand, op.cit.

p.515 "a bit more from Isidore, whose point he dulls", and in a note, "This last is maltreated by Remigius..." In fact Remigius represents Isidore quite correctly: the maltreatment is maltreatment of Remigius by the scribe of C, and by Manitius and Rand, who have not the wit to detect the corruption.)

C.42a5. Unde et legitimus alios vendidit sub corona.

R.9b12. Unde et legitimus, Alios vendidit sub corona.

These passages will serve to shew that the incompleteness of C is not a matter which calls for tears. Nevertheless the veneration attaching to the "älteste Ueberlieferung" will doubtless prove difficult to dispel, and if Dr. Lutz ever edits Remigius, she will hardly fail to make it the basis of her text.

Next in order of badness comes the Bodleian manuscript, Canon. Misc. 18, which I shall call B. A diligent collation of this

manuscript with B for the first book revealed 2000 variants (including spelling differences), in about five of which something might be said for the reading of B. The most striking feature of this scribe, apart from his stupidity, is his habit of reversing the order of two consecutive words. His ignorance of Latin can be guessed from such errors as "Sextus dicitur quod sit ab articulo pedis sextum librum corporis (f.1b26), where the true reading is "membrum" (R. 5b21), and "Ideo fingitur quod poeta Iovis diadema ... capiti Psichas imposuerit" (f.4a4), for the true reading "Ideo fingit poeta quod Iovis .. etc." (R. 9b9). It seems probable that the scribe of B made all these errors quo Marte, since I find no example of them in the other mss. I am inclined to think that B was copied from an archetype using insular contractions, since it uses þ for enim, tñ for tamen, and ð for ut, and occasionally confuses autem and enim. Against this view there is no example of h for autem. The manuscript seems to me to be of no value for setting up the text.

Less corrupt indeed than these manuscripts, where it is in fact giving the words of Remigius, but inferior to them by reason of heavy interpolation is B.N. lat 8672. Of the first 65 lines of this manuscript 25 are interpolated. Happily this degree of interpolation is not consistent throughout the text, but dies away gradually, until after five or six folios only a few extraneous words or glosses are found here and there. The origin of this

additional matter I have been unable to determine. There appears here the choice piece of folly that Martian imitated Socrates and Epimenides, which I remarked earlier in describing Florence Laur. 50,18: a note on "thalamus" seems to come ultimately from the Bodleian glosses in Auct. T. II,19. For comparison the two passages are:-

Parisinus:- THΛΗΜΑ Grece, i.e. voluntas: inde thalamus locus nuptiarum dicitur.

Bodleianus:- Thalamus dicitur ἀπὸ τοῦ Θελήματος, hoc est a voluntate.

But a great deal of the interpolated matter merely paraphrases what Remigius has to say elsewhere. So far I have found no place where a corrupt reading can be emended from this manuscript, so that its value for setting up the text seems to be very slight.

The fifteenth-century Laurentianus plut. 51,18 has so obviously suffered from the attentions of some late medieval or early humanist philologist, that its readings must be regarded with the gravest suspicion. Nevertheless such part of it as I have read seems to convey fairly well what Remigius wrote. It would be a work of supererogation for an editor to collate throughout a manuscript of so late a date, when there are manuscripts of the tenth and eleventh century available.

Merton College 291 exhibits the text in an unusual form, since the difficulties of the scribe's task have led to his relegating to

the final folio Hemigius' dissertation on the names of Martian and the nature of his work. The text offered contains several mistakes, but one or two interesting variants which may not be purely mistakes of the scribe, as "planabitur" (f.1a45) where the other manuscripts have "exponetur" or "explanabitur". Its readings therefore should not be entirely disregarded, although a full collation is unnecessary.

The remaining manuscripts are Paris n.a. 340, Avranches 240 and Laurent. 90 sup. 19. The first of these is interesting as bearing some few traces of insular contractions, and as having an occasional M and G to distinguish text and gloss. As I have said earlier, these letters do not occur often enough for us to infer anything about their original distribution. The insular contractions seem to establish something of a bond between this manuscript and Bodleian Canon. Misc. 18. The latter, in which insular contractions are much more to the fore, cannot have been copied from this, since otherwise we should have to assume that a continental scribe of the late eleventh century wrote þþ , $\text{t\ddot{h}}$ and $\text{u\ddot{}}$ just for variety's sake alongside his normal $\text{en\ddot{}}$, $\text{ta\ddot{}}$ and ut . The readings differ to a considerable extent, the Bodleian manuscript being almost always in the wrong. But there is one interesting case of agreement. On R f.7b17 there occurs the gloss:- Uxorium, i.e. uxori deditum. Orosius vero uxorios proletarios vocat, h.e. quod gignendae proli inserviunt. Where R and the rest read "Orosius vero", n.a.340 reads "Orosius vero auctor" and the Bodleian ms. "Orosius (sic!) vero auctor".

I am loath to believe that the scribe of n.a. 340, usually very accurate, would have written the superfluous "auctor" unless he had found it in his archetype. This archetype, inevitably a manuscript of great antiquity, would presumably have had insular contractions regularly. Unhappily I have been unable to find any manuscript which might be plausibly argued to have been the archetype of these two. Until the discovery of the archetype I have postulated, n.a. 340 must remain an important authority for the text.

Of equal antiquity and apparently of equal accuracy is Laurent. plut. 90 sup. 19, which should be collated thoroughly.

A difficult question is set by Avranches 240. The corrected readings are very good, but the readings of the first hand have little to recommend them. There is apparently a closer connection with R than is found in any other manuscript of the second group. Thus R 5a18 has "mutuis et alternis synzugilis", with "ⁿconiunctiⁿqibus" written over "synzugilis". All the other manuscripts have "id est coniunctionibus" written in the line; Avranches 240 has it superscript, as in R. In the next line of R "explanabitur" is given by A also, while the others have "exponetur". In line 21 R and A read "terra et aqua", the others "aqua et terra". Yet in other passages the two manuscripts frequently differ. What may be the relation between them I cannot so far guess, but it is clear that neither the first scribe of A nor the corrector was working from R₁ alone.

There can be no doubt that, failing the discovery of its archetype, the readings of A must be diligently recorded for all that part of the text which it covers.

The basis of a text of Remigius' commentary must then be a collation of British Museum Royal 15A XXXIII, Bibliothèque Nationale n.a. 340, Laurenziana plut. 90 sup. 19 and Avranches 240. The question will at once be raised - Is not R to be considered an interpolated version, since it gives additional matter not found in the other three? The answer has never been given, nor indeed has the question ever been squarely faced. Mr. Esposito's polemical propensities would not allow him to concede that R. might be a good manuscript of Remigius, while Manitius attributed the commentary to Lanchat. I hope to shew that the additional matter in R may with good reason be attributed to Remigius himself.

The title and beginning of the text in R (f.4a) run as follows.

IN LIBRIS MARTIANI MINEI FELICIS CAPELLAE NOVEN PAUCA INCIPUNT

Primo est transeundum per septem periochas, i.e. circum-

statnias, quae constant in initio cuiusque libri authenticī;

quae, ut Greco utamur eloquio, sunt TIC, TI, ΔΙΑΤΗ, ΝΟC,

ΠΟY, ΝΟΜΕ, ΝΑΤΕΝ. Ut haec ipsa ore Latino absolvamus, quis,

quid, cur quomodo, ubi, quando, unde. Ergo ad illud, quod

interrogatur TIC, i.e. quis, respondetur ΠΡΟCΩΝΑ, i.e. persona

auctoris; ut, quis scripsit? Martianus. Secunda periocha est

TI, i.e. quid: ad quam interrogationem redditur ΕΚΤΙΑ, i.e. res, quae titulo ipsius operis declaratur. Scripsit enim de nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii. Tertia periocha est ΔΙΑΤΙ, i.e. cur. Respondetur ei ΠΡΑΨΜΑ, i.e. causa, quare de nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii scripserit: videlicet, quia volebat disputare de septem liberalibus artibus. Quarta periocha est ΠΩΣ, i.e. quo modo: ad quod redditur ΤΡΩΩΣ, i.e. modus. Modi autem locutionum aut prosaice aut metricae sunt, quod utrumque iste in hoc executus est opere. Quinta periocha est ΠΟΥ, i.e. ubi: respondetur ei ΤΩΩΣ, i.e. locus: ut, Ubi scripsit? Carthagine. Sexta periocha est ΠΟΤΕ, i.e. quando: ad quam interrogationem respondetur ΚΡΩΩΣ, i.e. tempus; quod posteris indagandum reliquit et hactenus manet incertum. Septima periocha est ΠΑΤΕΝ, i.e. unde: ad quod respondetur ΥΑΗ, i.e. materies; ut, Unde descripsit? De nuptiis videlicet Philologiae et Mercurii, et de VII liberalibus artibus.

From this point on R gives the same text which we find in the other manuscripts.

It will be objected that there is no mention of Remigius' name. The work of which it forms a part is nevertheless known to be a work of Remigius, and it was his custom never to set his name to his works (see Montfaucon ap. Migne PL 131, 49D - In omnibus autem nomen suum tacuit etc.). In support of this

statement it may be observed that neither in n.a.340 nor in Avr. 240 is the name of Remigius to be found in a contemporary hand. A further sign of this humility may be the words PAUCA INCIPIUNT at the head of a commentary running to nearly 180,000 words.

That the matter is Remigian in appearance cannot be denied. The sectio circumstantiae, beloved of medieval writers from Augustine onwards, were favoured by Remigius in several commentaries (e.g. Phocas and Donatus), and the affectation of Greek learning is a foible of the man and his age. (NOTE is probably a scribe's mistake, since on the second occasion it appears rightly as NOTE. The startling EKPIA I take to be a scribe's blunder for ΕΠΙΑ.) The term "liber authenticus" is well enough known to Remigius, since he glosses it in commenting on Jerome's introduction to Genesis (see PL 131, 53B). The clear but pedestrian style is like that of Remigius' other works, while the phrase "tempus, quod posteris indagandum reliquit" is strikingly similar to that of his commentary on Donatus, "Tempus vero reliquit ad acuendum animum lectoris" (p.6 ed. Fox).

Despite these arguments, if the additional matter was first found in a manuscript of several centuries after Remigius' death, I should suspect the hand of an unscrupulous redactor, while admiring his ability to forge in so convincingly Remigian a vein. Since however the manuscript in question was written in the early

tenth century, or possibly even in the late ninth, while Remigius is known to have lived on for some eight years at least into the tenth century, I believe that we have here an addition made by Remigius himself to a work which had already gained some circulation.

The reasons I have alleged seem to me sufficient to justify the view that in R we have our best witness for the text of Remigius' commentary. The text which it gives is remarkably pure. In the first book there is one place where a slightly preferable reading may be adopted from one or more of the other manuscripts, and one place where I feel that all the manuscripts agree in the same error, which only bold and headstrong conjecture can restore (R 38a - philosophos, qui[†]introducentes[†]adinvenērunt. Sic add.: nam liberales artes?): yet for the rest there is little work for the textual critic, who, in surveying the numerous and accurate copies of a work of so little literary excellence, will scarcely forbear to deplore the perverted taste of monks, whose sloth robbed the world of many of antiquity's finest monuments, while their industry enriched the universities of Europe and America with an inexhaustible supply of research projects.

Section 6, Part 2.

Form and Characteristics of the Commentary of Remigius

Remigius' commentary contrasts strikingly with John's. I have remarked earlier (p.80) that John's interests are primarily philosophical and theological. Remigius on the other hand shows a keener interest in mythography and grammar. John writes in a highly individual style, which has found an admirer in Professor Rand: Remigius writes in a clearer but more pedestrian style. John is given to dogmatism and sweeping condemnation: Remigius is more temperate in his mode of thought and expression. In Remigius the sources which are being followed are faithfully reproduced, frequently in almost the same language as the original: In John everything taken from earlier writers has been coloured by the Irishman's peculiar habits of thought and has sometimes been reduced to a travesty of what the original authority meant. Finally the glosses of Remigius are much more complete than those of John - John's first book, his longest, runs to about 13,000 words; that of Remigius to about 22,000. These differences I shall exemplify in order.

John p.3.23 Iuta (p.3.5 Dick)

CAMENAM non generalem hic dicit, quia omnis Musa bene canens Camena dicitur; sed quia omnium in nuptiis canentium magistra est Venus, non immerito eam Camenam vocavit, quam postea

apertissime genitricem asserit Hymenei.

Remigius f.5a

Canena hic pro Venere ponitur. Dicta Canena quasi Canena a canendo, vel quasi canens melos.

John's note is purely philosophical and spun out of his inner consciousness: Remy's gives briefly the result of John's excogitations and adds a note on the etymology, taken from Macrobius (Som.Scip. II,3 - Musas esse mundi cantum etiam sciunt, qui eas Camenas quasi Camenas a canendo dixerunt.).

Remigius f.6b (p.43 Dick)

Calliopea una est ex novem Musis. Interpretatur autem secundum Fulgentium callion phone, i.e. pulchra vox. Sive Calliopea dicta puchrifica vel pulchre faciens, quia callos Grece pulcher, poio facio; hinc et poeta dicitur.

John has no note on Calliopea. Remigius here seems to take his material from Martin of Laon (Scolica Glossarum f.80b - Calliopea quasi calliphone, i.e. bona|vox. Signatus tamen derivatur a verbo callippoio Greco composito, quod est bene facio vel compono.), although he has obviously looked up Fulgentius (Myth. I,15 p.27 Helm - Calliope, id est optimae vocis) and is perhaps using Donatus (Comm. in Andr. prol. 3 - poetae a faciendo dicti sunt, ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιῆν . Remigius seems proud of this etymology, since he gives it again in his commentary on Donatus (p.16 Fox).

Remigius f.6b (4.14 Dick)

Crepusculum sanis, i.e. dubium. Hinc crepusculum dicitur/ dubia
lux inter diem et noctem.

Again where John has no note, Remigius has been unable to resist
an etymology, the particular source of which is not certain.

(Cf. Isidore, Origines V, 31,6; id. de Natura Rerum c.2, copied
by Bede (de Temporibus c.3 (col. 280A) and de Temporum Ratione c.7
(col. 325A); originating perhaps with Servius on Aen. II,268
or Donius 13.11 (p.20 Lindsay)).

John p.7.11 (5.15 Dick)

PARCAS autem intellige insolubiles diversarum qualitatum
necessitates. Aliant quippe phisici nihil ex caliditate ignis
et ariditate terrae, quamvis unam immediatamque syngiam
effecerint, nisi interiecta aeris humiditate frigiditateque
aquae adiuncta, nasci posse.

Remigius f.7b

Parcae sunt exceptrices et librarinae Iovis. Sunt autem tres,
Chloto, Lachesis et Atropos. Chloto evocatio Lachesis sors,
Atropos sine ordine. Quo figmento significatur primum
evocatio/humanæ vitæ: evocantur enim homines ex non esse
in esse. Deinde sors, qualiter cuique vivere sit. Succedit
postea mors, quæ est sine ordine. Nullam enim observat
dignitatem, nulli parcit ætati, sed indifferenter omnia trahit.

John overreaches himself in the subtlety of his allegorical interpretation: Remigius omits John's note and falls back upon Fulgentius (Myth. I,8) for a piece of mythographical information. John does indeed give the names of the Parcae later in the same gloss, but defers detailed discussion of them to a more suitable place ("de quibus suo loco disputandum").

John p.9.5 (6.12 Dick)

TORIS humeris.

Remigius f.8b

Tori sunt eminentiae vel pulpae brachiorum. Virgilius de equo - Luxuriatque toris animosum pectus. Aliis significatiōne sunt lecti, a tortis herbis dicti.

John is satisfied if his students understand the bare meaning of tori. Remigius illustrates the meaning with a quotation (Geo. III,81), and gives another meaning of the same word, together with an etymology derived apparently from Nonius (11112, Lindsay p.17) - Quod frontem lecticae struebant, ex ea herba torta torum appellatum. (~~If Mr. Mesley, the translator of Valerius Flaccus, had read his Remigius, he would surely not have translated "conspicuous toris Tiryntius" as "the Tiryntian hero, conspicuous on his couch"!)~~)

Remigius f.9b (7.13 Dick)

Inter diadema et coronam hoc distat, quia diadema speciale est, corona generale. Nam diadema est gestamen regii capitis,

corona vero potest esse aliarum rerum. Unde et legimus

"Alios vendidit sub corona".

The distinction between diadema and corona, not perhaps strictly relevant, is not made by John. Remigius follows Pliny (N.H. VII, 57,1 - diadema, regium insigne) and perhaps is thinking of Caesar B.G. III,16,9 reliquos sub corona vendidit.

John p. 7.33 (5.21 Dick)

Ops et Cybebe et Berecinthia et Rea vocatur, quam matrem omnium deorum fabulae fingunt, uxor Saturni, quae propterea Ops et Cybebe nominatur, quoniam in significatione terrae quae et fertilis est et solida frequentissime ponitur a poetis.

Remigius f.8a

Cybele dicta est quasi Cubele a soliditate. Ipsa est enim terra, qua nihil solidius est in elementis. Cubum enim Greci solidum dicunt: hinc et solidos numeros cubos vocamus. Vel Cubele dicitur apo tu kybiste tin cephalē, i.e. a rotatione capitis, quam exercebant in eius sacris Galli, i.e. sacerdotes illius.

The alternative etymology given by Remigius is taken from Servius (Aen. III,111), whom he uses much more extensively than does John.

Mythographical detail has little interest for John, but for Remigius it is the breath of his nostrils (see R. Klibansky, Medieval and Renaissance Studies I (1943) p.183), and nothing is more common than to find him enlarging one of John's notes in order to bring in fresh detail of myth or cult, for which his chief authorities are Servius and the first and second Vatican Mythographers.

John 6.17 (5.11 Dick)

PROMPTIOR FIDES. Promptior Fides, devotior. Fides dearum est una, de qua poeta "cana Fides" inquit "et Vesta".

Remigius f.7b

Fides est una dearum, de qua Virgilius "Cana Fides et Vesta".

Cana autem fides vocatur vel quod in canis est, i.e. in antiquis hominibus, vel quod Fidei sacrificantes dextram manum albo panno velatam habebant, per hoc insimuentes quod fides tecta debet esse, i.e. ne amicorum secreta manifestet.

Remigius adds to John's note the fruits of his own reading, employing Servius (Aen. VIII,636) or Mythographus Primus I,191, and perhaps Nonius (86M24 - CANUM: vetus anticum. Virgilius libro I, Cana Fides etc) and the Liber Glossarum (CA 583 Lindsay).

John p.8.4 (5.22 Dick)

MESTISSIMUS decorum senex Saturnus dicitur aut quia, veluti senectute confectus, tardissimus ac per hoc maestissimus

errantium cursum peragit suum, seu, quod a filio suo Iove et castratus est et suo regno expulsus, non immerito ~~illi~~ fingitur mestus.

Remigius f. 7b

Maestissimum seniores vocat Saturnum, Iovis patrem. Hic secundum fabulam a filio regno pulsus ad Italiam venit et a Iano rege Italiae susceptus est, eiue usum frumenti ostendit. Unde et Saturnus a saturando populo appellatus est. Cuius uxor Rea Ops dicta est ab opulentia, quam mortalibus tribuit ...

(There follows an explanation of maestissimus which does not differ in essentials from that given by John.)

John p. 39.17 (28.22 Dick)

CONSUS consiliorum deus.

Remigius f. 28a

Consus consiliorum deus. Hinc et Consualia dicuntur festivitates Cossi. Huins festivitae raptae sunt trecentae Sabinae a Romulo. Hinc Virgilius "Consessu caveae magnis Circensibus actus".

John p. 40.3 (29.13 Dick)

Numa quippe Pompilius, qui post Romulum regnavit, infinitam demorum turbam et invenit et coluit.

Remigius f.28b

Numa rex Romanorum fuit, oriundo camus, qui volens populum Romanum revocare ab amore armorum, quo sub Romulo flagraverat, invenit sacra deorum, fingens se colloquium habere cum Egeria nymphea. Ipse ~~etiam~~ libros pontificales repperit, et qualiter dii colerentur.

These examples will suffice to shew how differently John and Remigius regarded their task of elucidating the text of Martian. In their language no less striking a difference is discernible. John's Latin, as I have remarked, has been praised by Professor Rand. "John, on the contrary" says he "has a very decent sense of style, animated with lively thought and poetic feeling, and stamped with his minor stylistic traits." Remigius has had few admirers. Cardinal Mai thought that his commentary was "opus non spernendae eruditionis", but more modern Latinists have been severe in their judgments. Eyssenhardt observes of him "ipse codicem Gud. 335 saeculi XI olim tractavi, ut in orbe terrarum nunquam quidquam insanius scriptum esse satis confidenter spondere possim." Eyssenhardt must have been exceedingly fortunate in his Latin reading if he had never read anything more foolish than Remigius. Even though he did not live long enough to read the introductions and notes of Dr. Lutz, he had need only to turn over the golden pages of Fulgentius, Virgilius

Maro or the Hisperica Famina, in order to find material which would make Remigius or John or St. Teresa seem sane by contrast. But let us return from opinion to fact.

The style of Remigius is certainly less individual than that of John. Professor Rand has drawn attention to the features of John's style which he considers distinctive, chiefly consisting in the use of particles. The statistics for the use of particles in the first book of John's commentary as compared with that of Remigius, are as follows.

Particles introducing a cause or reason

	<u>John</u>	<u>Remigius</u>
enim	46	202
quippe	64	4
nam	14	53
siquidem	13	1
namque	2	11
utpote	-	14

Explicative Particles

id est	91	946
hoc est	138	60
videlicet	43	52
scilicet	4	13
subaudiis etc.	4	105

<u>Adversative Particles</u>	<u>John</u>	<u>Remigius</u>
autem	53	113
vero	48	50
tamen	18	19
at	1	1
rursus	-	3
econtra	-	2
<u>Concessive Particles</u>		
quamvis	10	5
quamquam	1	1
licet	1	4
etsi	1	-
<u>Illative Particles</u>		
ac per hoc	22	1
et per hoc	-	2
ergo	5	32
itaque	7	-
igitur	3	-
<u>Comparative Particles</u>		
sicut, veluti, quasi	passim	passim
veluti quidam (pleonastically)	35	1
quasi quidam "	2	3
quidam quodammodo "	-	2

<u>Asseverative Particles</u>	<u>John</u>	<u>Remigius</u>
quidem	7	8
non aliud nisi etc.	11	4
dico (in parenthesis)	13	-
<u>Expressions of Praise for Martianus</u>		
non immerito	10	-
pulchre	6	2
non incongrue	3	-
non irrationabiliter	3	-
merito	2	2
non inconvenienter	1	-
bene	-	18
recte	-	1
<u>Admonitions to the Reader</u>		
notandum quod	2	3
nota	-	2
intelligendum quod	1	-
ne mireris	3	-

In their choice of constructions the two commentators vary considerably, as the following figures will shew.

	<u>John</u>	<u>Remigius</u>
<u>Oratio Obliqua</u>		
acc. and inf.	127	70
quod with indicative	4	3
quod with subjunctive	2	3
quia with indicative	-	8
<u>Interrogatio Obliqua</u>		
with subjunctive	4	12
with indicative	3	-

But apart from the differences which can be thus mechanically tabulated, the style of Remigius is poles apart from that of John. A much greater simplicity may be observed throughout. Whereas John favours long sentences, distended by unwieldy parentheses, and diversified by remarkable reshuffling of nouns and verbs and their modifiers in order to obtain a pleasing clausula, Remigius makes no more attempt at an ornamental style than does Servius. A fair specimen to illustrate the styles of the two writers can be taken from their notes on 6,20 Dick, where they both wish to say that eloquence is of little value unless it be joined with wisdom.

John (n.9.15-20 Lutz)

SOPHIAM: sapientiam. In hoc loco si quis leges allegoriarum intentus perspexerit, inveniet Mercurium facundi ser^monis, hoc est copiosae eloquentiae, formam gestare. Hinc est quod

ipse Mercurius a Grecis Hermes, id est sermo, vocitatur. Sermo siquidem eloquens et copiosus rationabilis naturae, qui in homine specialiter intelligitur subsistere, maximum indicium est et speciale ornamentum. Sed quoniam ipse sermo, quamvis copiosus et eloquentiae regulis ornatus videatur inter homines currere, (quod nomen Mercurii significare videtur: Mercurius enim dicitur quasi medius currens, quia sermo inter homines currit), non solum infructuosus et inutilis, verum etiam nocivus esse perhibetur, nisi sapientiae pulchra atque modesta virtute, veluti cuiusdam virginis intemperatae sobrio atque modesto stabilitetur et moderetur amore. Non fabulose igitur, sed pulchre et verisimilitudine Cyllenius formatur intemperatae sapientiae pulchritudinem ardere Quoniam vero sapientiae castitas moderata supervacui sermonis immoderataeque eloquentiae effugit contagium, non immerito ad aeternas virgines describitur migrasse et consortium incontaminatae aeternitatis et integritatis, in cuius significatione Pallas formatur, nunquam desere voluisse.

Benigna L. Gh

Sophiam, i.e. sapientiam, quam quam veluti quandam virginem introducit amatam a Mercurio, quia nonnumquam sermo facundiae speciem praestendit sapientiae. Ideo et quodammodo

iungi vult ... (I omit two glosses on sororis collectae and indiscreto amica foedera respectively) Quod ergo Sophia non vult copulari Mercurio, hoc significat, quia licet sermo magnum sit ornamentum rationalis creaturae, sapientia tamen superfluum verborum ornatum respuit. Non quidem amari refugit, sed immoderatae verbositati misceri non consentit.

A ~~similar~~ example of contrasting styles is found where both commentators are explaining the mirror given to Psyche by Urania (Anie in the manuscripts of Martian).

John p.12.27 (8.1 Dick)

Virtus quippe recognitionis originis suae, qua ad imaginem et similitudinem creatoris sui condita est, seu liberi arbitrii notitia, quo velut maximo dono et nobilitatis suae indicio prae ceteris animalibus ditata est, rationabili naturae ex divinis thesauris concessa est atque donata: in qua, virtute dico, veluti in quodam speculo clarissimo lumine renidenti, dignitatem naturae suae et primordiale fontem humana anima, quamvis adhuc merito originalis peccati ignorantiae nebulis circumfusa, perspicit; et, quoniam ex sapientiae studiis et donis virtus recognitionis originis suae et libertatis notitia humanae distribuitur naturae, pulchre Sophia aditis Aniae speculum spiritualis notitiae et donasse et immutabiliter finxisse describatur.

Remixina f. 10b

Per speculum virtus intelligentiae accipitur. Quamvis enim anima mole carnea praegravata et merito originalis peccati tenebris ignorantiae circumdata sit, habet tamen quandam recognitionem, nec penitus amisit naturalem libertatem suam, concessa sibi speculo, i.e. intelligentia, quo ipsa recognoscat et caelestem suam velit requirere originem.

These examples show well enough how greatly the style of the philosopher differs from that of the grammarian.

As a natural result of his study of theology, John acquired the habit of intemperate denunciation. This charming quality is never more in evidence than in his dealings with the unhappy Gottschalk, who is addressed consistently as "haeretice", and whose views are spoken of as "devilish poison", and such other terms as Christian charity can suggest. In annotating a school text there is less opportunity for such a display of orthodox piety, but John finds many places where he can arraign the pagan folly of his author. "Haec omnia vanissima poetarum deliramenta sunt," he remarks in one place (17,34 Iutz): and again "Quoniam falsa sunt, nulla indigent explanatione" (31,17), or "poetice deliramenta sunt, falsis ^{et} opinionibus plena" (21,33). Of the Platonists he speaks as "secta Platonica, quae de apostrophia ... nimium insanit" (22,9): Numa

Pomilius, as we have seen above, "invented and adored an innumerable horde of demons" (40,3). There is frequently a certain over-emphasis in John's expressions; the words "apertissime" and "manifestissime" occur too often to carry conviction. Remigius on the other hand seems a much more tolerant man. He refers to the pagan gods politely as "dii", without even the qualifying "gentium" or "paganorum", while "daemones" is only used of them once, and that in a passage taken almost verbatim from Isidore. We have seen how the "infinita daemorum turba" of John's gloss was softened to "invenit .. qualiter dii colerentur" in Remigius' commentary. John's favourite "deliramentum" occurs only once in Remigius, to describe the fable of Hermaphroditus, where perhaps it may be thought not entirely to lack justification. Remigius' Christianity is well to the fore: he quotes the Scriptures in four places in his first book, where John quotes them not at all, and he naively repeats Rhabanus Maurus' etymology of orthodoxus, qui recte gloriatur in fide Sanctae Trinitatis (R f.29a: Rhab.Maur. de Universo IV,7), but like Sir Thomas Browne, he is "rather contenting himself to enjoy that happy stile, than maligning those who refuse so glorious a title". In this respect Remigius is looking forward to the later medieval synthesis, in which the classical writers, except where they were in direct conflict with the teachings of Christianity, were regarded as respectable masters in ethics; while John is still

living in the past, when the old pagans were living foes. In this connexion it is possible that his thought was saturated, as was his diction, with the bitter anti-paganism of the Civitas Dei.

The different practice of John and Remigius in representing the statements of earlier authors whom they are following will be sufficiently clear from the sections which I devote to their sources. Striking examples of John's perversion of source-material are found in the gloss (p.22,20 lints) in which Plato is credited with a heliocentric theory of the universe, and Chalcidius with a modified version of this view, according to which some planets revolve round the sun, some round the earth. Likewise Saturn is said "liberare mares de nuptiis" (p.67,19), a function which is ascribed by the classical authorities to Liber Pater: apparently John has retained only a confused recollection of what Augustine had to say on the matter. "John quotes like a gentleman, from memory", says Professor Rand approvingly (op. laud. p. 515). For my part I should be willing in these matters to see some sacrifice of gentility for the sake of accuracy. Remigius on the other hand goes to work in a more pedestrian spirit, and is not too proud to look up his sources and occasionally to quote them verbatim; as in the case of the long quotation from Macrobius on the subject of the Milky Way (see below p. 176). The only circumstances under which Remigius abandons entirely the words

of his sources are those in which the original passage is difficult or obscure, as many of John's glosses are.

These then are the principal respects in which the commentary of Remigius differs from that of John so far as the first book is concerned. I have not made direct comparisons with the other books, since there must remain some doubt as to how much of those books is John's finished work. Nevertheless we should judge Remigius unfairly if we did not consider also how he differs from his predecessors in the later books. I have already shown so far as my abilities permitted, that there is no convincing reason for thinking that Remigius had access to a larger version of John's commentary, as Manitius and Rand have supposed.

In the catalogue of philosophers and poets at the end of Martian's second book there is much which would have needed explanation for a reader in the ninth century. I have already spoken of the blend of ignorance and impudence which characterizes the notes of "Dunchad" on these names. Little of value can be derived from the glosses of Johannes Scottus, who gives a mere string of etymologies:-- ERACLYTUS gloriosus. ESICUS aequum carmen. TALES Milesius: sapientissimi Grecorum fuerunt. Democritus index populi vel index publicus. Remigius (f. 69a) gives more extended glosses on these names:-- Heraclytus gloriosus interpretatur. Hic dixit omnia ex igne constare: ideo dicit ardebat. Udus Thales. Hic de Mileto fait, unus ex septen

sapientibus, qui dixit omnia ex humore consistere. Videbatur Democritus circumfusus athomis. Democritus index populi vel index publicus interpretatur. Circumfusus athomis dicit quia dogmatizabat quattuor elementa ex athomis constare. ... Enycurus apportabat mixtas rosas violis. Hic sibi summum bonum statuit voluptatem. Zeno, Stoicorum princeps, de nuptiis disputavit.

Zeno's work on marriage is common property of all the commentators, and takes its origin from the "femina providens" who accompanies him in the pages of Martian. The knowledge displayed here of the ancient philosophers is not indeed profound - almost all of it can be found within the pages of Isidore's Origines - but it shews at least that Remigius was prepared to use the available sources in order to inform his readers, while his predecessors were content with cob-webs spun out of their own brains.

In its manner of presentation Remigius' commentary differs considerably from its predecessors. The commentary ascribed to Dunchad, as we have seen, consists of detached glosses of the most elementary kind. That of Johannes Scottus, although much more discursive in its treatment, is for the most part a string of disquisitions introduced by single lemmata. Remigius on the other hand weaves lemmata and glosses together very much in the manner of a spoken commentary given before a class. This method may be understood more easily from an example than from a description.

Remigius on Martian p.9.6 Dick

(Text:- amplius deliberandum suggerit Virtus. neque eum sine Apollinis consilio quicquam debere decernere, aut fas ab eius congressibus aberrare ...)

suggerit, i.e. suadet vel hortatur, amplius, i.e. attentius, profundius, deliberandum, i.e. pertractandum, cogitandum.

Neque debere eum quicquam decernere, i.e. statuere, ex sententia proponere, sine consilio Apollinis, qui, utpote divinus, futura praesciebat: aut fas, subaudis non esse dicebat illa Virtus, aberrare, i.e. deviare, absentari sive separari, ab eius congressibus, i.e. ab eius societate et contubernio. Ponitur etiam congressus pro amplexu: Virgilius "Congressus Pete, Nate, meos", i.e. amplexus.

But this practice is not followed consistently. Immediately following the example quoted comes a gloss on zodiaca hospitia, in which no attempt is made to follow the syntax of the original text. Especially is Remigius likely to abandon this method of exegesis, when he is led aside by the need to give a lengthy explanation. An example of this feature may be taken from the same page of Martian.

On p.9.10 Dick

(Text:- igitur constitutum ubicumque locorum frater esset adiretur.)

Igitur constitutum est, subaudis a Mercurio, admiratur, deest ut, ubique locorum esset: figurata locutio est, et res-solvitur, in quibuscumque locis. Sic etiam dicimus ubique terrarum et usquam locorum et usquam gentium, i.e. aliquo loco apud gentes. Notandum, quod Virtutem semper dicit inherere Cyllenio: sermo enim facundiae, quamvis ex se ornatus et clarus sit, nisi tamen virtute sapientiae moderetur, vagus et paene nullius utilitatis deprehenditur.

Here one might have expected that Remigius would go on to say "frater, subaudis Mercurii, Apollo videlicet", for Remigius spares no pains that his apparently very dull pupils shall understand perfectly. But he is led aside first by the unravelling of a "figurata locutio" (a term which, like "honestata locutio", he seems to borrow from Donatus' Terence-commentary), and then by the necessity to remind his readers that Virtus is to be thought of as still clinging fast to Mercury: and so the subject of the clause is left out.

The impression of a verbal exposition is heightened by Remigius' practice of asking his readers (or hearers) sudden and unexpected questions; which, as happens to most school-masters, he has to answer himself. Thus his commentary on the closing poem of Book II runs as follows:-

O lector, transcursa, i.e. terminata et finita, scilicet est fabula ex magna parte; quae, scilicet fabula, implicata, i.e. impedita et irretita sive involuta, tam morosis, i.e. valde tarāis et prolixis, ductibus, i.e. narrationibus, quibus quasi viis ducimur ad intellectum, coegit crenusculum, i.e. ortus diei, instans, i.e. imminens iam, et subaudis, innitens, i.e. conans, vel innitens, i.e. valde lucens et resplendens. Quid coegit? Palpitare, i.e. deficere a sua claritate, lucernam cum tenui lumine ...

and a little later

Ac nī... purpuraret ... culmina. Qua re purpuraret illa?

Rosetis, i.e. roseo splendore.

These abrupt apostrophes to the reader are of course not the exclusive property of Remigius. John puts questions to his readers on p.52,9 Lutz (ORSA: petitiones Et quae sunt illa orsa?) and on p.184,20 (Et redde causam, cur hoc? Quia flexior est signifer...). (One notes with regret, but without surprise, that Dr. Lutz is entirely ignorant of her author's practice in this matter.) In Remigius however such apostrophes are very much more frequent than in John. It may not be too fanciful to suppose that the long years which Remigius had spent in expounding Christian and classical texts had left their mark upon his style, and that when he sat down to write a commentary upon Martians

Capella, he couched his explanations in a form like that which old experience had taught him was the best for the classroom.

Thus much then for the form and characteristics of Remigius' commentary. When the whole work has been published and in consequence can be read in America, the world may expect much more detailed studies - perhaps even a concordance to Remigius may be produced, if ever Augustine ceases to provide employment. In the absence of any edition which has the slightest claim to be complete or critical, I have sought simply to point out the most striking features of this commentary, particularly those that mark it off from its fore-runners, and in so doing to accord Remigius a more just treatment than he has received in recent years.

To conclude this section I present as an illustration of the foregoing remarks a section of Remigius' commentary which has not hitherto been published, in parallel columns with the glosses of John and "Lunchad".

On Martian p. 73.10 - 74.19

"Lunchad"	John	Remigius (text of R)
Patris, i.e. Iovis.		O <u>patris</u> vis, i.e. virtus vel potestas, <u>ignoti</u> patris, i.e. Iovis
<u>Ignoti</u> : incomprehensibilis, quem nullus novit		<u>Ignoti</u> , i.e. incomprehensibilis vel incircumscripti. Val tu, O Apollo, prima propago
<u>Prima</u> : optima.		<u>patris</u> , i.e. prima pro-
<u>Propago</u> : proles		

"Dunchad"

John

Remigius

Fomes: ignisSensificus: sensum
faciens.Mentis, i.e. ani-
mas.Lucis, i.e. vitaeOlimpus quasi olo-
lampos, i.e. totus
ardens.

les. Secundum fabulam
primus Iovis filius est
Apollo, secundus Mercurius.
Quod figmentum
hoc philosophice vult
innuere, quod de gene-
rali mundi anima, quod
est Iovis, nascitur
consilium, quasi Apollo;
deinde post Apollinem
nascitur Mercurius,
quia post consilium fit
sermo. Fomes, i.e. in-
trumentum & origo vel
ignis, sensificus, i.e.
sensualis vel sensum
faciens. Ex sole enim
vis sentiendi procedit.
Hinc Macrobius, "Cum
sint caducorum corporum
haec duo propria, sen-
tire & crescere, natura
sentiendi, i.e. aethi-
con, de sole, crescendi
autem natura, i. phisi-
con, de lunari ad nos
globositate pervenit."
Fons mentis, i.e. memo-
riae vel rationis.
Origo lucis, i.e. vitae.
Haec omnia philosophi
nos a sole habere di-
dicunt. Regnum naturae,
i.e. princeps et rex.
Dignus, i.e. honor,
et assertio, i.e. de-
claratio vel demonstra-
tio sive laus divina.
Mundanus oculus,
h.e. illustratio mundi.
Nam in magno corpore
mundi sol quasi oculus
est. Fulgor Olympi, i.e.

"Dunchad"

John

Remigius

Cui, i.e. tibi.
Fas est: concessum
Patrem: Iovem

Circulus aethrae,
 quia omnes plane-
 tae sunt in
 aethere.
Parat: obtempe-
 rat.
Orbis: planeta-
 rum circulus

Raptibus, i.e.
 cursibus.

Superis: stellis
 Sunt enim stellae
 frigidae, sed tem-
 perantur calore solis.
Compellens, quando in
 statione sunt, coer-
cens quando retro-
 grada sunt.

Deum pro decorum.

caeli. Cui, i.e. tibi,
fas est, i.e. licitum
 est, ultramundum pa-
tram, i.e. qui est ex-
 tra mundum, vel super-
 substantialem, spaciata,
 i.e. intueri, Circulus
aethrae, i.e. sphaera
 mundi. Sol enim contra
 mundum currere fertur,
 ut suo cursu contrario
 frenet et sustineat im-
 petum mundi. Orbes,
 subundis sphaerae cae-
 lestis, sive planetarum
 circules, immensis rap-
tibus, i. cursibus tuis.
 Ideo, inquit, moderaris
 orbis planetarum, quia
curia medium iter in
 medio planetarum con-
 stitutus, habens supra
 te tres planetas, tres
 iterum infra. Eum enim
 locum obtinet sol in
 musica caelesti, quem
 mese, i. media corda,
 in musica artificiali.
Dans, i.e. dum das tu
solus unicam temperariam
superis diis, i.e. stel-
 lis. Stellae enim frigi-
 dae calore solis tempe-
 rantur. Compellens, i.e.
 impellens, movens et in-
 citans ad currendum,
atque coercens, i. con-
 tinens a velocitate,
 quando retrogradas eas
 facit. Radiis enim solis
 nunc inditantur plane-
 tae, nunc retrogradan-
 tur, nunc stationariae
 fiunt. Cum addis, i.e.

"Dunchad"

John

Remigius

Cursibus addis,
i.e. facis ea
retrograda et
stationaria.
Hinc est, i.e.
hac de causa.
Ius, i.e. ratio

Probetur: laude-
tur.
Numerus: quater-
narius.
Perfecta, i.e.
quaternaria.
Nonne hac, scilicet
ratione, vel
est adverbium lo-
cale, i.e. ex illo
quarto circulo,
vel a principio,
i.e. a chao, ut
subaudiatur mundi,
vel cum suo prin-
cipio facit hoc.
Geminum et asperum
et inferum inter
caelum et terram.
Gemina sunt tetra-
chorda, i.e. duo.
Septenarius enim
planetarum numerus
duo tetrachorda
efficit. Prima cor-
da lunaris circu-
lus, secunda Mercu-

Principio: Iove.

imponis, vel addis, i.e.
das, legem cursibus,
subaudis ipsorum
siderum. Hinc, i.e. hac
de causa, quod ius
i.e. ratio vel potestas
est tibi decurrere, i.e.
mease, quarto circulo,
pro circulo. In ordine
enim planetarum quar-
tum locum tenet sol.
Sive circum anni dicit:
cursus enim solis per
Olympiades, i.e. per
quattuor annos agitur,
denum quarto anno eis-
dem locis et horis side-
ralibus suum cursum re-
integrat. Ut probetur,
i.e. approbatur, iste
numerus, i.e. quaterna-
rius, perfecta ratione
sua. Probetur tibi. i.e.
in laudem tuam; vel
tibi pro a te. Nonne
das tu geminum tetra-
chordum? Hac, subaudis
ratione. Principio, i.
e. a principio. Geminum
tetrachordum dicit quia
inter terram et caelum
duo tetrachorda, i.e.
soni sunt. Cum enim sint
septem planetas, duo
tetrachorda faciunt, et
in primo tetrachordo
quodammodo prima chorda
est lunaris circulus.
secunda Mercurialis,
tertia Venerius, quarta
solaris, in qua finis
est primi tetrachordi
et initium sequentis.
Secundum vero tetra-
chordum est, cuius quasi

"Dunchad

John

Remigius

rialis, tertia Venerialis, quarta solaris, quae etiam finem prioris tetrachordi & initium sequentis obtinet, sicut mese in musica. Est igitur secundum tetrachordum cuius quasi prima corda solaris circulus, secunda Martis, tertia Iovis, quarta Saturni.

Post patrem, i.e. Iovem. Ferunt philosophi de generali anima Iovis consilium nasci, i.e. Apollinem. Post Apollinem natus est Mercurius, quia post consilium fit sermo. Latium: Italia. Bis senis propter XII signa dicit, per quas sol discurrit.

Quod, i.e. eo quod Menses in anno: horas in die. Dicunt: scilicet philosophi. Alinedas: veloces equos. Quattuor solisequis IIII elementa significant, i.e. ignem, aerem, terram & aquam. Solus domites, i.e. gubernes. Quadrigrum propter IIII tempora anni secundum numerum elementorum.

prima chorda idem solatis circulus, secunda Martis, tertia Iovis, quarta Saturni. Vocat te solem Latium, i.e. Italia. Exponit nunc causam diversorum nominum solis. Vocat te Latium solem, eo quod

solus tu sis apud lucis post patrem, i.e. post Iovem; et ideo Sol vocaris, quia perhibent sacrum caput tuum ferre aurea luma cum his senis radiis. Bis senis, i.e. duodecim: haec sunt et gemmae duodecim in corona Apollinis, duodecim videlicet signa et duodecim menses. Perhibent, subaudi astrologi vel philosophi. Ideo subaudi perhibent sacrum caput tuum ferre, his senis radiis. quod, i.e. eo quod, conficis totidem menses, i.e. duodecim. Dicunt te philosophi flectere quattuor alinedas cum habentis tuis eo quod solus domites quadrigrum quam dant quattuor elementa, i.e. regem et gubernes fabricam mundi, quam quattuor elementa faciunt. Sive etiam quadrigrum quam dant quattuor elementa annum dicit, qui quattuor constat temporibus,

"Dunchad"

John

Remigius

Retegis: declaras,
aperis; a te enim
est lux noctis.

Caerula: nox.

Plato solem Apollo-
na appellatum vel
cognominatum scri-
bit ἀπὸ τοῦ πάλ-
λιν καὶ ^{αὐτῆς}, i.e. a
inactu radiorum.

Futuri: quia Apol-
lo praest divina-
tionibus futuro-
rum. Phoebus in-
terpretatur pro-
dens occulta aut
dissolvens noctur-
na amissa. Phoebus
novus vel im-
berbis vel terri-
bilis vel crini-
tus.

(The text seems
corrupt, but I see
no sure emendation)

Iseum Serapin. Se-
rapis rex Egiptio-

Dissolvit: renovas.

Serapis maximum i-

quae tempora proprieta-
tes singulas elementor-
um habent: nam ver
aeri, ignis aestati,
hiemps aquae, autumnus
terrae convenit.

Retegis, i.e. ape-
ris et declaras, quod
lucet caerula, i.e.
quantum illustratur
nox. Caerula:
noctem dicit. Nam
cum sol die luceat,
ipse tamen facit etiam
lucem noctis, quia stel-
lae, ut saepe dictum
est, ab eo in ministe-
rium noctis illuminan-
tur. Hinc, i.e. propter
hoc, videlicet quia
tu obscura declaras,
parhiant, i.e. dicunt
te Phoebum prodentem,
i.e. sperientem, oc-
cultis futuri, i.e.
futurorum, vel futuri
subaudiis temporis
Vel quia dissolvit,
i.e. detegit et mani-
festas, nocturnis ad-
missis, i.e. crimina
quae admittuntur noc-
tibus. Igitur et di-
missis: quod si est,
ita solvitur: - Dis-
solvit, i.e. renovas;
ut sit sensus, Dissol-
vit, i.e. renovas,
nocturnam animam, i.e.
perdita. Species enim
et color amissus nocte
oriente sole renovatur
Te renovatur Nilus Iseum
Serapin. Serapis maxi-

"Dunchad"

rum fuit, quo mortuo ac inter deos translato, Isis regina ei sepulchrum fecit, unde et Iseus ei adicitur. Ipse vero ab Egyptiis deus adoratur, sicque etiam Apollo nuncupatur.

Memphis: pars Egypti.

Diassona: dissonantia sacrificia.

Mitra regina Egypti fuit.

Diton: Plutonen

Typhonem. Frater Osiris est Typhon. Attis Graece flos dicitur, quem ama-

John

dolan est Aegyptiorum, et vocatur alio nomine Iseus, i.e. aequus vel iustus.

Mitra: diadema.

Forum: speculum

Typhonem: superbum.

Remigius

rum idolum fuit Aegyptiorum. Iseum autem vel ab Iside, cuius maritus fuit quaeque ei honestissimum sepulchrum fecit, vel Iseum, i.e. iustum vel aequum; isos enim Graece aequus vel iustus dicitur. Nilus Aegypti fluvijs est, per quem habitatores Aegypti intellige, vel inferiorem Aegyptum. Memphis civitas est Aegypti, per quam intellige superiorem Aegyptum. Veneratur te Osiris. Diassona sacra, subandis venerantur te, sive veneratur te Memphis Osiris per diassona, i.e. diversa sacra quia diverso modo celestis, sicut et appellaris. Venerantur te Mitram, i.e. diadema vel coronam: sic te quidam vocant. Venerantur te quaedam sacra Diton, i.e. divitem. Et venerantur te quaedam sacra Forum, i.e. speculum et lucem ferentem. Vel Forum vocant solem quia in foro eius status adoratur; vel sicut forum locus est publicus, sic sol spectaculum est mundi. In omni enim mundi regione videtur. Vocant te Typhonem quaedam sacra, i.e. superbum vel magnum. Item, subandis diceris, et tu pulcher

"Dunchad"

John

Remigius

vit Berecinthia, i. e. altitudo terrarum, atque ideo Attis in solis adoratur figura, quia omnium florum princeps est sol et quodammodo creator. Attin Porphirius florem significare perhibuit.

Atti puer interpretatur impetus vel proximus.

Et puer, i. e. Triptolemus. Almus: sanctus ab alendo.

Arens dicitur Libies propter ferventissimum ardorem quem sustinet.

Biblus; Egyptius vel Nilivus. Adon solem significat: Venus, quae illum dilexerat terrenam

Atthis. Atthis secundum fabulam puer fuit, quem amavit Berecinthia. Atthis interpretatur flos, in cuius figura adoratur sol, quia ipse est princeps et causa florum omnium. Quem amavit Berecinthia, i. e. terra: terra enim constricta frigore huius desiderat relaxari et refoveri calore solis. Iohannes Scottus Atthin puerum impetum vel proximum dicit interpretari et sol puer et iuberbis depingitur, quia cotidie renascitur. Et scilicet vocaris almus puer curvi aratri, i. e. Triptolemus. Triptolemus puer quidam fuit, qui iubente Cerere docuit agriculturam per totum orbem. Vocaris etiam Hannon arentis Libies: genitivus Grecus; nominativus autem est Libie. Arantis, i. e. siocae; aestuat enim ardore solis haec regio Africae, unde Libia dicta quasi Libaya, i. e. egens succo, i. e. pluvia; vel quod inde flat Lys, i. e. ventus. Ac vocaris tamen Biblus Adon. Biblus, i. e. Aegyptius: in Aegypto biblus genus papyri abundat. Quidam dicunt

"Lunchad"

superficiem aestivo tempore omni genere florum pulchram atque honestam; aper qui Adonem interfecit hiemem significat. Adon igitur ab apro vulneratur, i.e. sole ab altissima parte signiferi descendente quasi in inferioribus signiferi partibus absorbetur: ibi celerissimum cursum super terras agit ut vix a nobis videatur. Sed dum sol hiemali tempore in austrinis partibus moratur, tunc tota terrae superficies pulchritudinem deponit et copiam fluminum gignit, quasi Venere totam pulchritudinem et copiam lacrimarum fundente.

Salve, quia in te resplendet facies decorum et facies patris. Trina: T CCC, II VIII, T CCC. Macrobius Apollinem NYCTHT vocat, quasi principem et ducem orbium ceterorum, quia NYCTHT princeps vel dux mentis dicitur.

John

Biblos civitas Aegypti; inde Biblos. Adon cantans interpretatur.

Vera facies: quia ipse solus manifestat omnia.

Cognomen: nomen
Et omen: mimen, i.e. potestatem.

Octo et Sexcentis:
HYC, II octo Y
quadringenti,
C ducenti.

Benignus

Biblos civitatem esse Aegypti: in Biblo enim civitate Aegypti vocaris Adon. Adon cantans interpretatur: fuit autem puer amasius Veneris, ab apro interfectus et a Venere multum fletus. Allegoriam huius fabulae require in glossis primi libri. Salve vera et indubitabilis facies, i.e. pulchritudo decorum. Ordo est - Salve vera facies, paterna ipsa, i.e. similitudo patris, et verus ultus, i.e. verus aspectus, decorum, qui conformat littera trina, i.e. tres litterae, sacrum cognomen et omen mentis, octo & sexcentis numeris. Cognomen, i.e. ~~HYC~~ NYZ; omen i.e. THY; sic enim Macrobius solem dicit appellari, i.e. ducem et principem caelestium orbium. Octo et sexcentis numeris: tau enim trecentos significat, H octo, item tau trecentos. Iohannes vero solem vocari dicit HYC, i.e. deum; in quo idem numerus reperitur. H octo, Y quadringentos C ducentos, Fiant simul DC et VIII. Cognomen mentis, subaudis mundi. Da tu, pater mentis; ut sit genitivus; vel da tu, pater.

"Punched"

John

Remigius

Aetherios: ultra
firmamentum
Noscero caelum,
i.e. ut ego dea
dicar.

mentes, nostras, ut sit
accusativus pluralis,
conscendere aetherios
coetus, et da noscere
astiferum caelum sub
sacro nomine, subaudis
tuo: vel sub sacro mi-
nime, i.e. ut sim sacra
et divina cum caelum
conscendero.

Section 6, Part 3 Sources Used by Remigius

Remigius' sources for his commentary on Martianus have never been thoroughly investigated. The latest attempt at a summary statement of them was made by Professor Rand in TAPA 71, 1940, in the following form:- "I wonder whether a minute study of Remigius's commentary on the First Book of Martianus compared with that of John would reveal anything more than these sources: (1) the prime source, John the Scot; (2) one or more other commentaries on Martianus, including that of Dunchad; (3) various standard books of reference, like Isidore, Paulus-Festus and the Mythographi; (4) something now and then from the compiler's own reading of the old authors, especially the grammarians; (5) cob-webs spun from his own brain".

This list leaves one wondering what else Professor Rand could expect to find, since he covers in fact every conceivable source of knowledge open to a human being, saving only direct revelation. Nevertheless the idea that lies behind his words is fundamentally sound, and his arrangement in order of priority is justified. The first two groups (John and other commentators) probably provide Remigius with about 70% of all his commentary. "Martianus cum glossis Domni Remigii" is a ninth century equivalent of a Dutch *variorum* classic; indeed the labours of a Remigius and of a Pitiscus

have much in common.

Remigius' debt to John has been shown by different scholars well enough to make it unnecessary for me to reheat the cabbage, but the way in which he uses the older commentary seems to have been misunderstood or misrepresented. Remigius is held up to scorn by Professor Rand and by Haureau, who seems even to see some sinfulness in Remigius' practice of incorporating other men's glosses in his own commentary without naming them, - "Il copie les annotations de ses predecesseurs lettre par lettre sans avouer ses larcins". (Notices et Extraits XXII (1862), p.7). Rand says grudgingly that "he does draw on other sources and manipulates his material in his own second-rate fashion, and therefore appropriately can inscribe the finished work with his own name". Such views are wrong-headed. Remigius did not write his voluminous commentaries in order to make himself famous or rich, but out of a zeal for learning for its own sake. In fact it was said of him in the Middle Ages that he never set his own name to any of his works, "ut cum sapientia humilitatis quoque culmen attingeret", and the truth of this story is supported by the fact that all the older manuscripts of his Martian-commentary bear no author's name, or only one added in a later hand. However it is my business to defend not Remigius' moral character, but rather his use of sources.

Firstly we should observe that Remigius does not follow John blindly, as Haureau seems to think. There are several places in

which he omits considerable sections of John's glosses, particularly where John's explanation is unsatisfactory. I find in Book I the following examples.

5.15 Dick Parcas

John: PARCAS autem intellige insolubiles diversarum qualitatum necessitates. Aiunt quippe phisici nihil ex caliditate ignis et ariditate terrae, quamvis unam immediatamque syzygiam effecerint, nisi interiecta aeris humiditate frigiditateque aquae adiunct nasci posse. Hinc est quod quidam postarum alludit, dicens

Nil aliud Vestam quam vivam intellige flammam,

Nataque de flamma corpora nulla vides.

Tres autem Parcas fingunt veluti tres cancellarias arearias sententiarumque ipsius custodes, quarum nomina sunt Cloto Lachesis Atropos, de quibus suo loco disputandum.

Remigius: Parcae sunt exceptrices et librariae Iovis. Sunt autem tres - Chloto, Lachesis et Atropos. Chloto evocatio humanae vitae; evocantur enim homines ex non esse in esse. Deinde sors, qualiter cuique vivendum sit. Succedit postea mors, quae est sine ordine: nullam enim observat dignitatem, nulli parit aetati, sed indifferenter omnia trahit.

The allegorical explanation given by John is entirely unsatisfactory, and Remigius does well to leave it out. He replaces

it by some etymologies taken from Fulgentius (Myth.I,7), but nevertheless comparatively rational.

13.23 Dick Tandem trans fluvios ... cum Virtute Mercurius constiterunt.

John:- Non immerito queritur qua ratione Virtus cum Mercurio planetarum circulos quaerentes Apollinem transcendere dicuntur, eumque ultra omnes planetas invenire, et iterum illos tres, Apollinem dico, Mercurium et Virtutem eosdem circulos consultum Iovis flagitantes transvolasse. Sed ad hoc dicendum ceterarum planetarum circulos circa solem esse ac per hoc centrum suum in ipso ponere, sicut Calcidius in expositione Timæi Platonis exponit. Ipse siquidem Plato planetarum omnium centrum in sole ponit, ita ut et sub sole sint integri et supra solem. Quid itaque mirum si iste Martianus, dum sit omnino (Platonicus), Platonica de situ planetarum documenta edisserit? Ac per hoc bis necesse erat Virtuti cum Mercurio planetarum circulos transire, primum quidem dum sunt infra solem, secundo vero adiuncto ipso Apolline dum sunt supra. Non enim Platonici circulum Saturni Iovis Martis nec non et lune ambire terram, sed solummodo (Saturnum) terram ambire perhibebant

The meaning of this passage seems to me to be very obscure. What, for instance, are "ceterae planctae"? Does John mean all except Mercury, or all except the sun? Why in the list of

planets given later is Mercury left out? If Saturnum is really to be supplied, is this not a most unnatural form of expression, and is not the astronomical theory thus ascribed to the Platonists a fantastic delusion? I suspect that Mercurii (sc. circulum) should be supplied instead: thus the passage would at least be consistent in its folly. But the value of this comment as astronomical theory is of less importance than the fact that it is manufactured to solve an imaginary difficulty. Martian sets his scene in heaven, which would wontedly be thought of as outside the outermost circle of the world. Mercury goes thence with Virtus to find Apollo, whom he wishes to consult, and they look for him at his various temples upon earth. Finally they hear that he is at Cirrha, where they duly find him. But before they can reach the presence of the god himself, they must cross certain rivers ("quosdam amnes caelitus defluentes"). The rivers are described in such terms as make it clear that they represent allegorically the astrological influences of the seven planets. John sees this clearly enough, and identifies them in order - Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, the sun, Venus, Mercury the moon. Mercury and Virtus cross the rivers, join forces with Apollo, and then rise through all the celestial spheres in turn until they arrive at Jupiter's palace. At this point John takes the suicidal step of equating the rivers allegorically with the actual physical circles of the planets, and Apollo with the sun, regardless of the

fact that he already has a circle of the sun among these seven rivers, and that the rising through the various spheres is not represented by Martian as a recrossing of the rivers. In the ensuing struggle with his material John misrepresents first Chalcidæus and then Plato, and finally, with a helping hand from Dr. Lutz, makes only Saturn revolve round the earth, while the rest of the planets (including presumably the moon) revolve round the sun.

In Remigius there is not one word of this business. Whether his own inner consciousness told him that the problem was imaginary, whether he was quite unable to make head or tail of John's note and therefore left it out, or whether he inferred from reading other commentaries on Martian that this was a private difficulty of John's, we cannot now tell; but whatever his motives, he did well not to burden his commentary with such a useless piece of lumber.

36.2 Dick (Despuens divitias oppressione quaesitas)

John:- DIVITIAS OPPRESSIONE QUAESITAS Hoc ait quia divitiae absque oppressione, hoc est labore, non adquiruntur. Vel potius Neptunus spernit divitias quas Pluto navigio mare opprimens per diversas mundi regiones quaerit.

Remigius:- Quaesitas oppressione, id est rapina et iniustitia. Semper enim divitiae aliorum oppressione aliis proveniunt. Quidam "oppressione, id est labore" accipiunt, sicut Iohannes Scottus.

Here Remigius has apparently considered a number of interpretations and chosen what seems to me the right one (oppressiones refers to the tyranny of death over all living things), while quoting John as an exponent of a possible but not so probable opinion.

These examples are, I think, enough to shew that Remigius is not using John's glosses in the spirit of an indiscriminate pillager, but considers them both on their own merits and in comparison with such other exegetical material as he had at hand, before incorporating it into his own commentary. It can also be conceded that where Remigius differs from John, he does so with good reason.

A question which may be answered here is, in which form did Remigius use the commentary of John? The question is raised by Professor Rand (op. cit. p.503), in connection with the present form of that commentary. His conclusion is that Remigius used a longer form of John's work than is now preserved; his argument being chiefly that much of Remigius' material is too good for Remigius to have thought of for himself, and that some of the latter's notes contain stylistic peculiarities suggesting John as their author. The first argument is of course no argument at all, since it tacitly assumes that all in Remigius which is too good to be his own work must come from John. In any case it is only too easy to say, and all too hard to prove, that any given passage is too good for Remigius. The passage from Book VII for instance, which Professor Rand adduces (op. cit. p.518) as a good and therefore Johannine

piece of exegesis, contains nothing above the commonplace in matter and is wholly jejune in style. As for the stylistic criteria alleged in favour of John's authorship, I cannot attach any weight to them in so small an extract. "For once", says Professor Rand, "Remigius left some of John's pet particles in place - quasi quodam, ac per hoc, hoc est, namque." That these particles are found often in John's works must be admitted, except in the case of namque, which seems to me to be relatively infrequent: but all are found to some degree in Remigius also. For example, in the latter's commentary upon Book I, I find "(801) medius planetarum quasi quidam spiritus fertur vivificare mundum" (13,1 Dick; R f.16a); "verba enim quasi quaedam semitae sunt animae" (18,15 Dick; R f.19b); while a similar pleonasm is found on f.15a "quaedam quodammodo vulnera" (11,18 Dick). Ac per hoc is certainly far more characteristic of John than of Remigius, but the latter uses it on f.25a - "Virginalis pudoris, ac per hoc magni" (25,6 Dick) while at per hoc occurs twice in the first book. Hoc est is not so much John's private property that it can serve to prove this passage non-Remigian, since I have found sixty examples in Remigius' glosses on Book I. Professor Rand's evidence does indeed seem to suggest a longer form of John's commentary is being utilized, but in itself it does not constitute a demonstration.

If however we confine our attention to such of John's glosses as are preserved, we find that Remigius used both forms of his

commentary, namely that in the Paris manuscript followed by Dr. Lutz and that in the Bodleian manuscript discovered by Miss Labowsky. Following the latter's practice, I shall denote the first by C, the second by B. The most striking example of "contamination" is found on Martianus p.50,16 Dick, as follows:-

C (Lutz p.61.9)

MAGNESIA regio nobilissima Scithiae ubi abundant poete & flumina, ibique canes optimi sunt.

B (f.30a)

Magnesia est vicina Thesaliae, cuius fons Libethris poetici haustus nomine caelebratus.

Remigius (R f.47r)

Magnesia regio est Scithie, vicina Thessalie, abundans tam poetis quam etiam fontibus. Ibi est enim Libetron fons Musis consecratus.

In the first book there are many examples of similar borrowings from both versions, although none which so aptly illustrate Remigius' method. The use of C in Remigius has been proven so abundantly by Manitius and Rand that I need merely take examples from B to demonstrate the extent to which that version also was used.

B (f.23a)

Item ex septem (26,15 Dick) Videtur esse error in hoc loco scriptoris. Nam sic debet esse - Item et octo residui, quia XX selecti dii sunt, ut ait Augustinus in libro septimo de

Civitate Dei. Hos deos selectos Varro unius libri contexione commendat ... (The names of the Dei Selecti follow.)

Remigius (R 26b)

Item ex septem. Locus iste, sicut male legitur, ita male et exponitur. Legendum namque est, Item et octo residui scil. vocantur. Nam XX sunt selecti dii de quibus Varro plenissime disputat, Beatus quoque Augustinus in libro septimo de Civitate Dei. Sunt autem Ianus etc.

C (Lutz p. 38.8)

ITEM EX SEPTEM RESIDUI, hoc est qui in disticho sunt praetermissi corrogantur venire.

Perhaps this last gloss is an example of Remigius' "male exponitur".

B (f. 23b: 28.9 Dick)

Lynsa deus bestiarum, ab eo quod est lynx bestia.

Remigius (R f. 27b)

Lynsa silvestris, .i. bestiarum dea, a Greco quod est lynx.

(C has no gloss on "Lynsa".)

B (f. 24a: 30.3 Dick)

Adra petra; Adrastia petrosa, dura. Inde Adriaticum mare petrosum mare dicitur. Aut ab eo quod est adranes, infirmitas & impotentia, quia propter infirmitates & impotentias hominum factae sunt sortes.

Remigius (R f.29a)

Adrastia interpretatur petrosa sive dura, nam adra Grece petra dicitur. Hinc & Adriaticum mare, quod sit saxosum & periculosissimum. Adrastia autem significat sortem, quae dura est et inexorabilis. Sive Adrastia dicta a Greco quod est adranes, .i. infirmitas vel impotentia. Sortes enim propter impotentiam humanam repertae sunt, quia per se nesciebant homines eligere quid esset eligendum vel quid vitandum.

C (Lutz p.40.5)

ADRASTIA sortilega Iovis; pro sua inhumanitatis duritia tale nomen accepit; Grece enim duritia adrastia vocatur.

These instances, which could easily be multiplied shew clearly enough that Remigius used either the manuscripts B and C or others very like them.

In addition to the commentary upon Martian, other of John's works contributed to Remigius' glosses. From Book I, I take the following example of the use of material from the De Divisione Naturae in conjunction with the specific gloss.

On Enteleshia (7,10 Dick)

C (Lutz p.10.16)

ENDELICHIA ut Calcidius in expositione Timaei Platonis exponit perfecta aetas interpretatur. Aetas quippe adulta ΕΛΕΚΙΑ a Grecis dicitur. Endelichia vero quasi endos ΕΛΕΚΙΑ hoc est intima aetas. Generalem quippe mundi animam Endelichiam Plato

nominat, ex qua speciales animae, sive rationabiles sint sive ratione carentes, in singulas mundani corporis partes sole administrante vel potius procreante procedunt, ut Platonici perhibent.

De Divisione Naturae I. col. 476G

Plato siquidem, philosophantium de mundo maximus, in Timeo suo multis rationibus asserit, hunc mundum visibilem, quasi magnum quoddam animal, corpore animaque componi ... anima vero ipsius est generalis vita, quae omnia, quae in motu atque in statu sunt, vegetat atque movet. Hinc Poeta,

Principio caelum ac terram camposque liquentes
 Lucentemque globum lunae Titaniaque astra
 Spiritus intus alit.

Remigius ad Martiani loc. laud.

Endelychia secundum Calcidium perfecta aetas, secundum Aristotelem absoluta perfectio interpretatur. Plato tamen endelychiam animam mundi dicit. Et dicta Endelychia quasi endos lechia, .i. intima aetas. Philosophi namque animam mundi vocant illum spiritum quo vegetatur et regitur mundus, de quo poeta "Principio caelum ac terras" et cetera usque ad "spiritus intus alit". Et Apostolus, "In quo vivimus, movemur & sumus." Ex hac ergo anima mundi secundum philosophos ministrante vel inserviente sole dicunt gigni omnes speciales animas, rationales sive irracionales.

Remigius' use of the so-called commentary of Luchad is no less apparent than his use of John. A few examples will be enough to make this clear.

"Luchad" on Martian 69.2 (Lutz p.2.24)

PYRFLEGETONTA est igneus fluuius totum infernum ambiens de circulo Martis manans. Figurata significat turbidam corpulentamque huius infimam aeris naturam quae concreta est igne de superioribus tracto et aqua et aere, in quo pagani putant peccatrices animas dampnari. Poete dicunt quod ex circulo Martis igneus Phlegeton progreditur, id est fluuius in quo torrentur animae malae viventes in hoc saeculo. (The ms. readings should be corrected - infimi, torrentur, male.)

Johannes Scottus ad loc.

Pir ignis, flox flamma. Inde PYRPHLEGETONTA igneus ...

Remigius ad loc. (R f. _____)

Pyrflegetonta subaudis fluuium, .i. igneum Flegetonta.

Flegeton fluuius est inferni, a Greco dictus quod est flox, .i. flamma. Est enim totus igneus, ambiens infernum, de circulo Martis ad lunarem circulum descendens. Figurata significat turbidam corpulentamque huius inferioris aeris naturam, quae concreta est igne de superioribus tracto et aqua de inferioribus hausta, ex quibus aer densescit atque crassatur. In quo putatur peccatrices animas purgari.

"Dunchad" on Martian 68.16 Dick (Lutz p.2.16)

TRIPTES quasi trepidantes, vel trinam potestatem habentes in corporibus, in umbris, in spiritibus.

Johannes Scottus ad loc.

Tripto inde TRIPTES lusores dii. (After tripto we should insert Græce ludo.)

Remigius ad loc.

Triptes, .i. lusores, a verbo tripto, .i. ludo, quia deludunt homines dormientes. Sive Triptes dicuntur species daemonum, quod habeant triplicem potestatem, in corporibus, in umbris & spiritibus.

But there are several passages in which Remigius seems to shew distrust of "Dunchad"'s glosses. Apart from the instances in which he tacitly rejects the latter's explanations (e.g. the absurd notes on 67,18; 68,6; 69,5; 78,14), there are many cases where "Dunchad" is only mentioned as a second string to John.

"Dunchad" on Martian 71.18 Dick (Lutz p.5.20)

Hæc tabula sub figura artis negotiatoriæ describatur. Mercurius namque quasi mercatorum kyrios, .i. dominus etc.

John and Remigius interpret the various elements in the picture as symbolising the powers of rhetoric. Then Remigius adds (R f.64a):-

Quidam hanc tabulam sub figura artis negotiatoriæ exponunt.

Mercurius namque dicitur quasi mercatorum kyrios, .i. dominus ... etc.

"Dunchad" on Martian 73.3 Dick (Lutz p.7.2)

FORMA LEONIS In Leone enim multum fervet sol.

Johannes Scottus ad loc.

FORMA LEONIS in arbore picta significat solem in summitate
mundi constitutum et omnia felicia visibili mundo administrantem ...

Remigius ad loc. (R f.64a)

Forma leonis in arbore picta significat solem in mundi summitatem
constitutum & cuncta felicia mundo visibili ministrantem

Sunt qui formam leonis calorem aestatis accipiunt. Tunc enim
fervet sol quando est in Leone.

Unhappily "quidam dicunt" in Remigius is not always to be
taken as a reference to "Dunchad", since in the gloss on 74,13 Dick -
"Quidam dicunt Biblos civitatem esse Aegypti" - the reference is to
Johannes Scottus, and in the note on 71,18 Dick - "Quidam pinacem dicunt
esse capsam organi" - Remigius must mean both John and "Dunchad".

So far it has become clear that the basis of Remigius' commentary
is provided by the commentaries of John and of "Dunchad", the former
being usually preferred. That other commentaries were also drawn upon
was demonstrated by Professor Laistner in 1925 (Bulletin of the John
Rylands Library 9, p.130 seqq.), although it seems unlikely that these
should have been full-scale expositions like those of "Dunchad" or of
John on Book I. The fragments of Martin of Laon's glosses certainly
seem to have been little more than lecture notes taken down by his students.

That there was no commentary by "G" or "M" of the manuscript Paris 12960, I have already demonstrated. (above p.32-35). It remains to be seen what material Remigius brought to the task from his reading of works not specifically written for the elucidation of Martian. These may best be taken in order of importance.

Most frequently used is Isidore, whose Origines and De Rerum Natura are both drawn upon to supplement notes of the earlier commentators. For example, John's explanation why Martian was called Capella is not enough for Remigius, who tells his readers (R f.4b):-

Capella dictus est ab acumine igenii. Capella enim ceteris animalibus acutius videt, unde & Grece dorchas vocatur, a verbo quod est dorcho, .i. video.

This etymology comes from Isidore, Origines XII, 1,5:-

..... agrestes capras, quas Grassi pro eo quod acutissime videant δορκάς appellaverunt.

To John's explanation of "γυμνολογίζεις" Remigius adds that gymnasium, a further cognate, signifies a place of exercise. For this definition he is indebted to Origines XV, 2,30. In commenting on "lyrica pagina" (p.5,8 Dick), he draws upon Origines VIII, 7,4 for an etymology. "Volatilem virgam" (o,12 Dick) gives him an opportunity to bring in a note on caduceus and caduceator taken from Orig. VIII 11,48. The explanation of the moon's oblique motion (namely to avoid frequent eclipses), which Remigius gives in commenting upon "flexmosis ambagibus" (p.12,24 Dick, where all Dick's codices have "anfractibus"),

is taken from Orig. III, 56. A long note on the influence of the planets upon human character is interesting as shewing that Remigius sometimes checked John's glosses against the original sources. The passages are these:-

Johannes Scottus (on 11.20 Lick: Lutz p.19.35)

ANNES dicit planetarum circulos, qui veluti quaedam fluentia per aetherea spatia non desimunt currere. Annes autem non immerito dicuntur, quoniam nulla planetarum est ex qua per occultos poros aliqua qualitas in terrena, aetherea et aquatica^{non} defluat, verbi gratia, palliditas a Saturno, sanitas a Iove, fervor a Marte, vitalis motus a sole, pulcritudo a Venere, agilitas a Mercurio, a luna humida corpulentia.

Remigius ad loc. (R 16a)

Quicquid enim in mundo est, sinibus planetarum ambitur atque circumdatur: unde et singula quaeque a planetis nos accepisse dicunt philosophi - a sole quidem vitam, quia ille medius planetarum quasi quidam spiritus fertur vivificare mundum; a luna corpus, quia illa est hūmida; a Saturno tarditatem & frigiditatem, quanto enim extimae sphaerae vicinior, tanto tardior, et quanto a sole remotior, tanto frigidior est; a Iove temperantiam; a Marte fervorem & iracundiam; a Venere voluptatem; a Mercurio prudentiam...

Isidore. De Natura Rerum III.4

Proinde autem gentiles ex his septem stellis nomina diebus dederunt, eo quod per easdem aliquid sibi effici aestimarent,

dicentes habere ex sole spiritum, ex luna corpus, ex Mercurio
linguam et sapientiam, ex Venere voluptatem, ex Marte fervorem,
ex Iove temperantiam, ex Saturno tarditatem.

It would however be tedious to continue giving examples of the use of such standard works, which, so far as I have been able to find, are used some fifty-three times by Remigius in his glosses on Book I. It may on the other hand be interesting to notice that there is enough evidence to tell us not only that Remigius used Isidore, but also what manuscript he used. In glossing "palaestra" (6,11 Dick) Remigius says that the word may be derived "apo ton palon, .i. a motu urnae, quia per sortem luctabantur." Isidore in Origines XVIII, 24 says:- Palaestram ἀπὸ τοῦ πᾶλλειν , id est a motu ruinae fortis, nominatam dicunt." The correcting hand in Lindsay's C (Leidensis Vossianus lat.F.74) gives the reading "a motu urnae, id est sortis". Again in glossing "stilos" (30,12 Dick) Remigius says "Epystilia dicuntur capita columnarum, quasi super stilos, .i. columnas." Isidore (Origines XV, 8,15) says that "capitolia" are the capitals of columns, and that "epistolía" are the parts placed on top of the capitals, i.e. the entablature - "Capitolia dicta quod sint columnarum capita, sicut super collum caput. Epistolía sunt quae super capitella columnarum ponuntur." In Lindsay's C the words quod ... epistylia were omitted by the first scribe and added by the corrector. The result of this addition in a different hand may have led Remigius to take "epistylia" as being defined by the words that preceded, instead of by those that followed.

Second only to Isidore for frequency of use is Servius. Remigius seems to have known his Virgil well (he quotes him eight times in commenting on Book I), and the commentary must have been no less familiar to him than the text. To John's bare identification "CONSUS consiliorum deus" (28,22 Dick; Lutz p.39,17) he adds from this source "Hinc et Cossualia dicuntur festivitates Cossi. Huius festivitae raptae sunt trecentae Sabine a Romulo. Hinc Virgilius, Consessu caveae magnis circensibus actus." (Cf. Servius on Virgil A.8,636.) On Martian 10,9 Dick, where John gives no note on "situ", Virgil and his commentator provide another note - "Situ, .i. vetustate: situs autem proprie est lanugo terrae quae nascitur in locis obscuris vel neglectis et soli inaccessis; et ponitur pro vetustate. Sic Virgilius, Et te victa situ ..." This is a paraphrase of Servius on A.7,440. As might be expected, Servius, who is used about thirty times in the course of Book I, contributes chiefly grammatical and linguistic observations, and details of myths and cults.

Macrobius is almost as prolific a source as Servius. In Remigius' commentary on Book I there are some twenty-five examples of material drawn from him, although of course there is much overlapping with other sources. A striking feature in Book II is a quotation in extenso from S.S.I,15 giving the opinions of Theophrastus, Diodorus, Democritus and Posidonius upon the nature of the Milky Way. (R f. 68b, commenting upon 77.15 Dick). Remigius shews an acquaintance with the Saturnalia as well as the Dream of Scipio: Book I provides him with material in ten

instances for his commentary on the first book of Martian, Book III and Book VI in one case each. The information derived from Macrobius is usually philosophical or astronomical.

Pliny the Elder provides a good deal of information, although it is difficult to say to what extent Remigius used the text for himself. Certainly the identifications of the precious stones worn by Juno (pp. 31-32 Dick), although taken in the beginning from Pliny, were the common property of all the commentators upon Martian. But in addition to this material, I find ten examples of astronomical lore taken from Pliny's second book in the course of Remigius commentary on Book I.

Solinus was evidently well known to Remigius, since he mentions him by name as an authority for the story of the dolphin and the crocodile (R f. 64b, Solinus c.32, 44^a Salmasius).

Among the Fathers, Augustine is the most frequently used, particularly the sixth and seventh books of the City of God, which provided useful material for glossing Martian's catalogue of divinities. There are a few cases where the Hexaemeron of Ambrose seems to have been used, but there is not unequivocal instance. I can find no example of material taken from the works of Gregory the Great. The latter's name does indeed appear in the margin of f.68^a opposite a quotation on the infinitude of God - "Extra quem nihil, infra quem

nihil, supra quem nihil; in quo omnia, sub quo omnia, cum quo omnia ... etc"; but the annotator has, I think, confused this quotation with a passage of Gregory's in the Eighth Homily of his first book on Ezechiel - "ubique est, et ubique totus est ... etc".

Important sources for mythographical material are the Vatican Mythographers I and II and the inimitable Fulgentius, who is cited once by name and provides information in a dozen places in the commentary on Book I. A disquisition upon "Taumantias" (31,10 Dick) on f. helps neither to prove nor to disprove Manitius' theory that Remigius and Mythographus Secundus are the same person. Hyginus seems to be used surprisingly little.

Remigius does not seem to make an extensive use of glossaries. A dozen of his verbal glosses may come from the Liber Glossarum and three or four from Abstrusa, while four passages within the glosses on Book I are derived from Festus.

Among grammarians and commentators one can trace the influence of Donatus' Terence-commentary, of Lactantius Placidus on the Thebaid, of Nonius Marcellus and, if I am not mistaken, of Virgilius Maro, who seems to have given Remigius the notion that the Greeks used participles in place of finite verbs ("Stringens pro stringis, more Græcorum, qui participium frequenter ponunt pro verbo"; cf. Virgilius Maro p. 163,28 Huemer). There is but little use of Priscian, although his Carmen de Ponderibus is mentioned in the glosses to Book II.

Remigius' knowledge of the classical poets seems to have been very respectable. Of Virgil I have already spoken: Remigius quotes also Horace (Odes IV, 1,10 and AP 63 and 309), Ovid (AA I, 239) erroneously ascribed by Remigius to Horace, through confusion with Odes III, 21,18, Lucan (II, 273), Juvenal (II, 86), Persius (V, 35), and Statius (Theb. VIII, 738 erroneously ascribed to Claudian). In the commentary on Books I & II there is very little to suggest a wide acquaintance with the classical prose-writers - a quotation from Cicero's De Inventione (probably taken direct from John) a few words from Caesar's De Bello Gallico (probably from an intermediate source), two or three references to Varro (all taken from Augustine) make up the whole tale.

Among authors who are used to a surprisingly small extent are Boethius and Bede. Although the former is constantly cited in the glosses on Book IX, as published in Migne, the musical information in Book I seems to have been taken from Martian himself. It is not surprising that advanced works on the arts, such as those of Boethius should have been drawn upon only for the individual "artes", not for the preceding "Nuptiae". While there is no lack of material on astronomy and general cosmology which might have been taken from Bede, all of it can be paralleled from other sources, such as Isidore's De Natura Rerum.

The resources drawn upon by Remigius in his glosses upon the first book of Martian may now be assessed. First and foremost is the commentary of Johannes Scottus, which forms the basis of Remigius' exegesis. To this groundwork is added material selected from other commentaries, including that which is ascribed to Bunchad. The work of selection from all these commentaries is on the whole judiciously done. The glosses thus assembled are then enlarged by the products of Remigius' own reading, which, although not startlingly wide, included the standard reference-works of the time, the more popular works of the Fathers, and the principal classical poets. The information gleaned from these sources is not always relevant, nor does the handling of it imply great critical sagacity, but it contains much for which the medieval reader must have been grateful. Professor Rand, may, if he will, call Remigius' work "scissors-and-paste"; but I think it must be conceded that the scissors were applied to a great many different books, and that the paste proved surprisingly enduring.

CONCLUSION

The subject matter of this thesis has not been the most ~~regarding~~ that can be imagined. We have dealt with the fortunes of one of the least attractive classical authors during a period of remarkable literary decadence. The despised Martianus Capella, the butt of every Latinist's epigram, has come to appear in comparison of his commentators a bottomless pit of learning: the commentators themselves, as in a Rake's Progress through the centuries, have been outshone in turn by the editor whom they have found in a land of which they had never heard. From a writer whose style indeed was defective, but whose learning was not to be despised, we have descended to an editor who thinks that Bissextilis signifies the second of August. It is perhaps desirable therefore to offer some apology for so gloomy a theme, and to suggest some aspects of this field which may be, 'if not interesting, then at least' instructive.

In the first place we have here an opportunity for studying the genesis of a medieval commentary. The commentary attributed to Dunchad shows us an early stage in the formation - the mere assembly of interlinear and marginal glosses in a form detached from the text. That of Johannes Scottus is entirely different - a philosophical explanation conceived rather as a key to the work than a collection of glosses upon it. In Remigius' commentary the

two methods have been united, and allegorical interpretation takes its place beside detailed verbal exposition.

Thus much interest may attach to the three commentaries when considered together. In themselves separately they are not devoid of instructive lessons. The commentary of "Dunchad", as I have said, serves merely to illustrate how profound might be the ignorance of a man who should yet set up in the ninth century to teach others. That of John must derive its interest from the character of its author, a man capable indeed of folly and ignorance, but a remarkable example of intellectual independence in an age where pre-eminence in learning consisted for the most part in mastering as far as possible the heritage of the past. To say aught in praise of Remigius, whom so many have so severely damned, may seem perversity: nevertheless, if a literary work be considered important in proportion to its popularity, his long commentary on Martian must be allowed to possess some significance. Not only does the number of manuscripts testify to its wide circulation in the Middle Ages, but there is no lack of authors whose knowledge of classical mythology is taken more from Remigius than from any of the older sources. In itself the commentary is instructive as shewing the level of attainment of a man who enjoyed the greatest reputation for learning among his contemporaries, and thus as indicating the highest level of teaching in the monastic schools of the ninth and tenth centuries.

Thus much may be said in defence of the subject. To defend my treatment of it is perhaps more difficult. I have inspected but a quarter of Remigius' manuscripts, and studied but two ninths of his commentary. I have been unable to trace a family-tree of textual tradition, and of the source-material I have scarcely done more than scratch the surface. I may defend myself by claiming at least to have cleared some rubbish to make room for future workers. From the manuscript B I have had the good fortune to find many corrections of corrupt places in the text of Johannes Scottus; a closer examination of C has enabled me to dethrone it from the high esteem it once possessed, and to banish from the medievalist's demonology the phantom commentators H and G. My contributions by way of conjecture or index-thumbng to the text- and source-criticism of Johannes Scottus deserve little praise, since they were made possible only by the defects of previous work in this field. In the case of Remigius I have only been able to suggest the lines along which future research may best be prosecuted. A great deal of work remains to be done before the medieval commentators on Martianus Capella can be presented to the world in an authentic form: that I have done so little to bring that presentation nearer, I am bound to regret. Yet if the greatness of the task be considered, that plea of Boeckh's may serve for my defence - "cogitent, pro inchoata rem a nobis, non pro absoluta haberi; veruntamen satius esse visum, non absolvisse eam, quam non inchoasse".

APPENDIX I. Critical Observations upon C.E. Lutz' text of Johannes Scottus.

p.3,3 τετρανόμος) This is not a Greek word and should not be printed as such. John presumably means τετραωνύμος (cf. Priscian II, p.61, 1 Keil). For contemporary examples of similar formations see Remigius, Comm. in Genesim, PL 131, 81D (trionyma) and 85B (dionomia) where the true reading no doubt is dionyma.

3,6 Capella autem...) This passage is very corrupt. I suggest the following reconstruction:- "Capella autem quia, sicut quedam satyra (sive matrix eius sive admonitrix fuerit, suis scriptis non aperte patet) eum nominavit, lascivus<fuit>et petulantia poetica instabilis, dum debuit philosophus esse..." The change of ex to et was suggested by Professor Rand.

3,19 Mercuriusve) Mercurius vero conj.

3,20 quasi) quae conj.

4,2 et) This word (or the "et" in line 1) should be deleted.

4,27 similitudine) similitudinem conj.

4,28 recipiens) recipientem conj.

5,28 carminibus: ludentes) Punctuate: carminibus ludentes:

7,3 interponitur...pesita) ponitur...interposita conj.

7,28 gamma) The ms. reading should be retained.

8,16 vocatus) vocatur conj.

8.22 firma) firma est conj.

8,23 sententia) sententiam conj.

9,6 palestricis) palestitis conj.. So also the manuscripts of Remigius.

9,13 versatur) versat conj.

10,7 Punctuate thus:- Non irrationabiliter quoque PRONOMS etc.

10,8 Providentia) Providentiae conj.

10,11 aperte) apte conj.

10,33 videantur) videatur conj.

11,1-3 The whole sentence is unsatisfactory. There should be a dative depending upon distribuit, yet to replace animarumque by animabus quoque seems too long a shot.

11,13 nulla) nullam C

11,29 ricinium) The manuscript reading resolutoricinium is supported by the manuscripts of Remigius.

12,16 describit) distribuit conj.

12,19 quia auguria quae sive volatibus avium sive omnia) quia sive auguria quae volatibus avium sive ~~omnia~~ conj.

12,27 recognitione) recognitionis conj.

12,35 recognitione) The ms. reading recognitionis is sound.

13,9 quidam) cuidam conj.

venere) veneri C.

13,18 inquireunt) inquirent conj.

11,2 inquirat) attollit conj.

11,4 praecipitat) The sentence ends here. Quod autem sequitur is a conventional device for introducing the next lemma.

14,15 facundia) facundiam conj.

14,24 Faretratus deus CUPIDO) FARETRATUS deus Cupido (8,23 Dick).

15,4 rectae orationis) recto rationis conj.

15,5 propitissimo) promptissimo conj.

15,12 benedicendi) bene dicendi

15,24 FISSICULATI) fissiculatis C extorum) EXTORUM. A lemma glossed by
iliorum

15,28 quibus videlicet fanis sortitus) QUIBUS videlicet fanis SORTITUS.

These words are the remains of a lemma and gloss, but the explanation
of sortitus has been lost.

16,31 eadem) eadem C.

17,20 quod) notandum quod conj.

17,25 futuri) praeteriti conj.

17,26 consistebant) CONSISTERANT. A new lemma (10,19 D).

18,1 FORTUNARUM) fortunarum. The genitive is governed by imagines,
not by spectacula.

18,3 commutati) commoti conj.

18,10 extremes) actus conj.

18,22 Communis) This word introduces not a new sentence, but the main clause
to which quoniam...coniunguntur is subordinate.
totum) totum conj.

18,26 intervenirent limata) INTERVENIRENT LIMATA. These are lemma-words
(11,7 D).

existimat) existimet C

- 19,15 colligit) colligi conj.
- 19,16 Punctuate thus:- solis et lune intervallo terre ac lune etc.
- 19,17 efficiet) efficiat conj.
- 19,32 SAGITTARIUM) SAGITTARIUS conj., with all Dick's codices.
- 19,35 fluentia) The ms. reading fluente is sound.
- 20,3 furor) fervor conj. Cf. infra 53,16.
- 20,6 unde) UNDA conj. A lemma-word (11,24 D).
- 20,22 temperatam equalitatis) temperatae qualitatis conj.
- 20,23 Tertius vero) TERTIUS VERO. A new lemma (12,4 D)
- 20,25 Qui eum sequebatur) QUI EUM SEQUEBATUR (12,7 D)
- 21,1 quia) qui conj. (qua C).
- 21,10 madafactos) madafacti conj.
- 21,14 proprie) propria conj.
- 21,10 Praeterea duo) PRAETEREA DUO. (12,17 D).
- 21,11 dicunt) dicit C.
- 22,19 The comma must follow vixerint, not misera.
- 22,25 est) The insertion is unnecessary; cf. inf. 27,17.
- † 22,29 Platonious) Platonica C, corr. Manitius. (Platonious) Platonica conj.
- 23,23 perhibeantur) perhibeatur conj.
- 24,24 ex quo) EX QUO (15,8 D).
- 24,34 vero) verorum conj.
- 25,12 adoptione) adeptione conj.
- 25,22 VOLUPTAS) VOLUNTAS conj... So all Dick's codices.

† I now find that Professor Rand anticipated this conjecture.

- 25,24 solites) This word is apparently of Dr. Iutz' own coinage. The manuscript reading is solitus es.
- 25,32 Philologiam) Philologia conj.
- 26,6 flumine) fulmine. The ms. reading might be interpreted as either.
- 26,11 per regna fratrum) Part of the lemma.
- 26,16 subdimus) subdimur C
- 27,2 quia) quia neque conj.
- 29,6 FULSERUNT) FULSERIT conj. So all Dick's codices.
- 29,31 qui et) quietus conj.
- 29,35 crederetur) creditur conj. The verb governs ALLUBESCERE, the next lemma.
- 30,6 poete) poetice conj.
- 32,3 praeparaent) praepararent conj.
- 32,4 omnium,) OMEN conj.. OMEN PROSPERUM is a new lemma.
- 32,5 adherenti) adherentem conj.
- 32,10 suffragiri) suffragari C.
- 33,7 conspectu) conspectum conj.
- 34,5 est) esse conj.
- 34,18-21 This senseless farrago may be reduced to order by pointing out that noctibus universis, freta, Tartarusque, and ac decorum omnium sedes are all lemmata.
- 35,14 quod autem sequitur) A new sentence introducing the lemma QUOTIENS.
- 36,2 sublevasse) sublevata conj.
- 36,4 de quodam p. v. q. l. loco) DE QUODAM etc. (24,12 D).
- 37,18 posse) posset C.

37,25 universales) universales conj.

38,13 fingantur) finguntur conj.

38,24 Greci) Grece conj.

38,26 NOCTURNOS) NOCTURNUS conj. Cf. Dick, app. crit.

40,7 Fortes) sortes C.

40,10 Adrastia...variantur) These words should be deleted.

41,29 interstringit) interstinguitur conj.

41,31 Punctuate thus:- viridis gemma Iris claritatem...etc.

42,23 quoque) quaeque C.

44,1 Huic) HUIO. HUIO...VESTA ADHAEREBAT is a lemma (33, 17-18 D).

44,25 dicitur) dicit conj.

44,27 gestare dicitur) gestari dicuntur conj.

44,35 sodiacum) sodiaci non conj.

47,2 pueri renitentis) PUERI RENIDENTIS all Dick's mss.

47,3 ad tertia) a tertia conj.

47,5 fatigatus) fatigatum conj.

fatigatione) festinatione conj. (vix fastigatione).

47,19 PLURIMUM) PLURIMO conj. So all Dick's codices.

49,7 vitream) vitam conj. rightly.

49,15 GEMINOS) Geminos. The word is John's, not Martian's.

49,19 primas) prius conj.

51,24 erratibus) conatibus conj.

52,9 et quae sunt illa orsa.) Punctuate:- Et quae sunt illa orsa?

Cf. infra 184,20.

52,18 RECUSIO) RECURSIO all Dick's codices.

53,20 illi) ille conj.

53,23 additum) ADDITUM (40,7 D).

53,4 CREPUNDIA vestram) CREPUNDIA VESTRA. (vestra is in fact the ms. reading).

55,23 οειρῆνες) hyerene C hirene B. hirene should be retained in order that the etymology shall make sense.

55,24 s) The reading of C is in fact s., i.e. scilicet. On.B.

56,11 tenebris flores) Thus C²; C¹ had tenerris flores. terrenis floribus B. teneri sunt flores conj.

56,25 negociatore) Thus G. negotiatorio B. negotiations conj.

57,4 XYPPIN) XYPPIH B. The "lemma" is not found in Dick's text for obvious reasons.

57,5 N] Thus C²; H BC rightly.

57,8 LONGITUDINEM) This is a chimæra. longitude BC. The word is not part of the lemma.

Latidudine) latitudine BC.

57,9 latitudine) latitudinem BC

57,17 non) noni B

57,19 partibus) paribus BC

57,29 Qui sunt) Qui, subauditur B. "Qui " is a lemma (44,19 D)

57,28 DELERATIO) dei eratio BC rightly. Cf. Dick, app.crit.

MA THN TETRAAA) This reading supposes Kopp's conjecture to have been in John's text of Martian. It also makes the gloss incomprehensible. mathen tetradan (the reading of G) must be retained.

- 58,5 est imparium) Thus C. om. B¹, imparium B^m. est should be deleted.
- 58,26 hoc est semel) Thus BC. The reading seems corrupt, but I can see no plausible correction.
- 59,7 ALLINIBAT) allinebat BC. There is no reason to amend.
- 59,8 allinibat) " " " "
- 59,11 Fronesis) So BC. Fronesi scilicet conj.
- 59,21 FRONOSAPIO) Φρονω sapio, fronesis sapientia prudentia B.
- 60,6 arca plena) Here B adds:- acerra autem dicitur arca turaria. sunt) scilicet B.
- 60,7 valare) velare, occultare B.
- 60,9 βρωεις) Here B adds:- ambroses sunt in Scithia et in India populi humana carne vescentes.
- 60,25 continet) Here B adds:- Orbita curva, id est quot circules unaqueque orbita intra se tenet; verbi gratia solaris orbita Venere^u Mercurialem lunarem terrenam.
- 60,28 Tardantur sidera...latitudinem signiferi) Either the sentence beginning "tardantur" or that beginning "retardantur" should be struck out. The second, apparently originating from a marginal correction of the first, is the only one adopted by Remigius.
- 61,5 temporibus dicit) Here B adds:- et quanta revolvat; id est quot sidera sol in retrogradationem mittit, id est vertit.
- 61,8 CIRCI...veniunt) om. B.
- 61,9 MAGNESIA.....sunt) Qui Magnesia. Magnesia est vicina Thesaliam, cuius fons Libethris poetici haustus nomine caelebratus. Et fons Gorgonei tulit caballi. B.

- 61,21 Traciae) Here B adds:- Sonare carmen. Carmen pro auctore carminis Orpheo quidem (quodam conj.) posuit. Organicas beare circis. Circus est ambitus musicae modulationis, hoc est ad eundem sonum a quo inchoat reversio.
- 61,23-25 PINDARUS...palacia) om. B.
- 61,28 eras) Here B adds:- Per cruenta rithmica musicam humanae vocis astruit.
- 61,29 significat) Here B adds:- Tugata linea. Angulum significat. maxima figurarum) maxima genera figurarum B.
- 62,6 COMICUM) So BG. comicorum conj.
- 62,15 catalecticum) Here B adds:- Ians Philologiae de arte rethorica atque grammatica.
- 62,16 rethorice) rethoris B
- 62,23 muneris) Here B adds:- Tranquam si diceret, Aliquando stringis, hoc est arguis et colligis arte grammatica, aliquando ludis arte sophistica, quae maxime constat ambiguis sententiis.
- 63,3 LAETA) laetor B rightly.
- 63,4 Aruspicio) aruspicina phisica, quam a Stoicis dicit esse sumptam. Constat autem hoc metrum ex duobus coriambis, ex tribus trocheis et sillaba. B.
- 63,5 id est cunque) quodcumque B
- 63,15 dictus) dictum B
- 63,16 INTREPIDIS) John evidently took this as IN TREPIDIS.
- 63,19 divinatio...fallit) secunda per augurium B.

63,23 *Laus Philologiae*) *Laus quaeris* C, om. B. Dr. Lutz' emendation can hardly be right, since the subject of this "metrum" is in fact the praise of Mercury. Nevertheless "*Laus Mercurii*" is a violent emendation.

63,27 *virgam*) *habere virgam* B.

63,28 *memorabile*) So BC. *memorabilem* conj.

64,7 *arbiter*) *rethor* B.

64,12 *Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας*) *periermenias* BC, the regular medieval spelling which should be retained.

64,16 *id est certissimas regulas artium*) So BC. I suspect that these words are a gloss on "*disciplinas*" (56,21 D), which should be inserted as a lemma before "*id est*".

64,24 *splendoribus*) om. B. The words are meaningless. It is just conceivable that "*semel*" may be a corruption of "*speculis*" (58,1 D: see Dick's apparatus), and that "*splendoribus*" may be a gloss on it.

64,25 *GLABELLA*) Thus BC. *GLABELLA MEDIETAS* conj. The lemma-word has been lost before "*ruditas*" of like ending.

64,26 *glabrio*) *glabrion* C, *glabrum* B. *glabra* conj.

64,29 *CARITES*) *Cantes* BC and all Dick's codices. The corrupt lemma must be retained to explain John's etymology.

65,10 *foliis*) *libro* BC. The ms. reading is correct.

65,29 *pro differentiam*) There seems a certain harshness in making "*pro*" govern the accusative. *per differentiam* B.

- 66,12 <est>) The reading of C is not sunt, but s., i.e. scilicet. So also B.
- 66,17 significat) Here B adds:- Per crocineum colorem splendorem superum, per humorem albidum splendorum aetheris et aeris significat, per soliditatem interiorum terram significat.
- 66,23 Apotheosis) So BC. Apothesi scilicet conj.
- 68,3 SUSCIPIMUS) Thus C. suspicimus B and all Dick's codices.
- 68,5 SUPERIS) supparis B and all Dick's codices.
- 68,6 PROPHECIA) So BC PRODIGIA conj. (Lemna, 65,3D).
- 69,6 <est>) The insertion is unnecessary.
- 69,11 constitum) constitutum BC
- 69,22 cognitam) cognatam B.
- 70,1 <est>) Dr. Lutz' conjecture is confirmed by B.
- 70,2 redeant) redeant BC. I cannot understand the emendation.
- 70,8 FANTUI) Thus C¹. fatui BC² and all Dick's codices.
- 70,12 AETHERIA) Here B adds:- Iuno hic de se ipsa tanquam de alia loquitur tali sensu: Ego, quae potestatem huius aeris habeo lucusque, id est usque ad culmen arcis aetherae, et diva mortalium inter priores genios, id est inter propinquiora terris numina consisto, tua, quae adhuc mortalis eras, diva non ero; modo vero, dum immortalis divaque facta es, ero tibi in divam aetherae et immortalium potentem. Hic enim Iuno aetherea vocor et Vesta, et tibi praecipio, Sede in concilio Iovis. (Cf. "Dunehad" ad loc.)
- 70,25 Punctuate thus:- ... nutritur, fingitur Ops in Iuno.
- 71,3 in Mercurio) Mercurio BC.

71,7 Organi) Here B adds:- in qua ordines fistolarum figuntur.

71,21 id est) ideo B.

72,3 <dies>) Dr. Lutz' conjecture is confirmed by the reading of B.

72,7 videtur) Here B adds:- regnum naturae, hoc est rex seu plenitudo.

72,10 fiunt) sunt B.

72,16 iustus) Here B adds:- Paret, obtemperat. Raptibus, id est cursibus.

Admissa (amissa cod.), id est tenebras quas nox amittit.

72,19 ATTI...proximus) Atti Grece flos dicitur, quem amaverat Berecynthia,

is est altitudo terrarum, atque ideo Attis in solis adoratur figura,

quia omnium florum princeps est sol et quodammodo creator. ^uPer inter-

pretatur impetus vel proximus. B. There seems to be some deep-seated

corruption. I do not see how "puer" can be made to mean "impetus vel

proximus". Perhaps we should read:- Puer<id est Triptolemus. Tripto-

lemis autem> interpretatur ... etc.

72,23 SEXCENTIS) Here B adds:- Numeris cui littera trina. Macrobius

NYCTHT
Appollinem ^Lvocat (vocant cod.) quasi ducum et principem orbium ceterorum.

THH: T trecenti, H octo (occto cod.) T trecenti. THH autem inter-

pretatur dux. Conformat: componit. Omen hoc est potestatem.

NYC CCC) om.B

72,22 COGNOMEN...potestatem) om. B.

72,24 igni) Here B adds:- Immoratur, hoc est tenet.

73,8 dicitur) Here B adds:- Defecta lassitudine, hoc est consumpta, quia

defectos facit. Symphoniam, hoc est consonantiam. Emensi erant, id est

ascenderunt. Absolutae modulationis, id est perfectae harmoniae. Perfectio

musicae, id est plenitudo, diaspason est. Verna: amoena. Formasque decanorum,

~~hoc est decanorum~~, hoc est decem caelestium regionum duces.

- 73,2 HIC) So BC. This is not a lemma-word, and should probably be struck out as having arisen by dittography from dic. i.e. dicit.
- 73,20 tres deos) lemma-words: a new gloss begins at "peñ".
- 73,21 ostendit) Here B adds:- Universum coercitum, hoc est totan universitatem circumscriptam (circumscriptam cod.)
- 73,32 pro planetis) pro om.B rightly.
- 74,24 sunt) scilicet B.
- 75,4 FRINGENTE) frigente B and all Dick's codices.
- 75,5 FRINGENTE) frigente B Dr. Lutz' critical note refers to the "fringente" in line 4, not line 5.
- 75,7 LEPORE facundia) Lepori facundiae B.
- 75,8 pigmento) figmento BC, which should be retained.
- 75,21 vel) om.B rightly. The comma after "rhethorum" must be deleted.
- 75,28 in ludum) "in" is a creation of Dr. Lutz' own, appearing in neither B nor C.
- 76,3 SCALPRO) scalprum B and all Dick's codices.
- 76,4 significat vel pennas) significari vult B. Either reading might be defended. ACUMEN seems not to be a lemma-word, but to be part of John's explanation - "(By "scalprum") he indicates the acuteness of the grammatical discipline".
- 76,18 abitudine) a bitumine B.
- 76,26 Iatricem) Manitiis(conjecture is confirmed by B.
- 77,9 Natura) So BC naturae conj.
- 78,3 facit) So BC FACIAT conj. A lemma (96,20 D).
- 78,4 Sive) This is not the beginning of a new sentence: QUO...transit is a paraphrase of 96,20 D.

- 78,12 Punctuate after "corrorationabilitas", not after "vero".
- 78,23 HAEC ET NOMINA, UT) haec nominavit B. HAEC NOMINA UT conj.
- 81,2 SUPERUM... 88,4 eodem casus) These glosses are omitted in B.
- 88,6 mitari) So BC mutare conj.
- 88,11 quam) qualvis B.
- 88,12 duos) Thus BC. deos conj.
- 88,16 <ab>) Dr. Lutz' conjecture is confirmed by B.
- 88,22 <a>) The addition is unnecessary.
- 88,26 ut) So BC. et conj.
- 88,33 Hauréau's conjecture is confirmed by B.
- 89,3 vel "Si bene disputare...praedicativus) B^m reads:- vel si bene disputare utile est, utilis est bene disputandi scientia. At bene disputare utile est. Ecce condicionalis. Utilis est igitur dialectice. Ecce praedicativus. I suggest the following reconstruction, starting from line 2:-
 tertia ab utrisque mixta, ut est "Si ridet, homo est, ridet autem, igitur homo est. Vel "Si bene disputare utile est, utilis est bene disputandi scientia" - ecce condicionalis - "at bene disputare utile est, utilis est igitur dialectica," - ecce praedicativus. This is the example of a mixed syllogism given by Martian himself, p.206, 18-23 D.
- 89,11 propositiones) propositionis B.
- 89,19 VERSAT) Thus BC VERSET conj., with all Dick's codices.
- 90,25 Athena) So BC. Athenae conj.
- 90,32 confirmatio) Here B adds:- et assumptioni alia confirmatio^r et conclusioni tertia confirmatio.

- 91,5 Haureau's conjecture is confirmed by B, which reads "sive versa vice particularem abdicativam primo ... &c.
- 91,21 conducere) concludere B.
- 91,23 "Homo pictus non sit animal") Not a quotation.
- 93,7 Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας) The ms. reading "periermeniis" must be retained. The medieval title of the Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας was Perierhermeniae or Liber de Perierhermeniis. There is no reason to consider either "Isagogae" or "Perierhermeniis" as a lemma.
- 95,1 essentiam) non essentiam B.
- 95,30 de subiecto (primo)) So B¹C. in subiecto B² rightly.
- 97,25 pio iusto) So BC. perfecto iusto conj.
- 97,26 voluptate) So BC voluntate conj.
- 97,34 ipsas substantias) ipsis substantiis B.
- 98,23 diffinitionum) What sense or syntax is to be got from this "emendation" I cannot see. In fact both mss. read "diffiniuit" for so "diffiniū" in C is to be expanded.
- 100,7 περὶ Ἑρμηνείας] Perierhermeniis, as the mss.
- 101,34 Punctuato thus:- repulsio est INTENTIONIS...INTENTIONIS is the objective genitive depending on "repulsio".
- 102,17 generationem) negationem B.
- 101,31 dixerunt) Thus BC dixit conj.
- 103,9 reflexionis) reflexe BC rightly.
- 103,16 ratione) rationi B. ratio conj.
- 103,24 abdicativae...dedicative) dedicative...adificative B rightly.
- 104,8 si bene disputandi utile est) Thus BCC The reading is intolerable. si bene disputare utile est conj. Cf. Mart. P.206, 21D.

104,4 conditionalis) condicionalis B. John's indication of his own spelling (sup. 103,25) should not be disregarded.

104,7 ut est) So BC. ut est<utilis>conj. "scientia est utilis" is the "aliquid aliunde assumptum".

104,11 et iterum, si aliter, recurre) Et item si aliter. Recurre B. Et...aliter is a new lemma (207,7 D).

104,18 particularis) particula BC rightly.

104,30 Punctuate thus:- ..."Rhethorica". Igitur subiectiva propositionis "ars" fit declarative assumptionis, quia ..."

105,1 particularis) particula BC rightly.

105,4 subiecta) subiectiva BC rightly.

105,12 nota) Thms C. tota B.

105,31 conducit) concludit B.

107,7 sine aspiratione scribatur) Dr. Lutz has ignored this indication of John's own spelling. B. usually has "retor" and "retorica".

108,19 annum Iovis) Not Jove's year, as Dr. Lutz seems to take it. A comma must be placed after "annum".

108,32 Grecorum locorum) Grecorum, locorum.

109,13 humilis) Here B adds:- tria enim sunt que unusquisque retoricus debet habere, id est ut humilis...A verb is wanting. Perhaps "sit" should be supplied after "ut".

109,16 summam) So BC summa conj.

109,17 id est primo) Om. B. "publici nominis" is a lemma (212,18 D). "epilogi" seems corrupt: I suggest "rei publicae".

109,26 SAPIENS VEL CIRTUS...Fecit) { sapiens vel virtus pestis
 { vir articulus mala et contraria fecit { ΔINOC vel ΔINOC
 ANHP TA KAKA KAI ENANKIA ETOIZO B. Dick might well be excused for
 omitting the "lemma".

109,29 CONIURATIONES) So BC CONIURATIONIS conj., with Dick's codices.

111,26 quaeque nova facit) A new lemma and a new sentence (218,3 D).

112,2 illum) So BC. illud conj.

112,15 Punctuate thus:- ... respondet tantum per negationem. CONIECTURA
 ERIT. Semper coniecturalis ... etc. The lemma is from 219,11 D.

113,4 convictionem) condiccionem B. contionem conj., with all Dick's codices.

113,10 The quotation ends at "iste".

113,19 cuius iudex finis est) So BC. The words are difficult. Perhaps we
 should read:- Cuius iudicis finis est UTILITAS... etc.

113,32 nam deliberatio futuri temporis est) A slightly modified lemma (221,3 I)

117,1 DECUMUS) Thus BC DECUMAS conj. with all Dick's codices.

118,31 ARGUITUR) Thus BC ARGUITUR accusatur conj.

118,18 Depulsor) Not part of the quotation.

118,27 QUAMVIS) So BC. QUAVIS conj. and all Dick's codices.

119,2 concluditur) Dr. Lutz' conjecture is confirmed by B.

119,14 Punctuate thus:- ,, , altercationes, de honestate vel necessitate
 in deliberativo, de laude vero vel vituperatione in demonstrative.
 Ergo ... etc.

119,34 aut quis) AUT QUIS (lemma 232,9 D).

120,2 diligatur) So BC. deligatur conj.

120,18 accidere) So BC. accedere conj. and all Dick's codices.

120,26 adversus quam intentionem) Lemma, 234,3 D.

120,28 duo) A new sentence starts here.

120,34 LIBRATUS) This should follow "ponitur" without a break.

121,3 κατηγορία)KATHETOPIA BC. It is idle to correct John's mistake.

121,5 contrarias) So BC. contraria conj.

121,6 Incidens, causa) incidens causa B. incidens quaestio conj.

121,21 interpositi fuerunt) interpositi fuerint B. interposita fuerit conj.

121,32 fortiter) A new lemma (235,15 D).

122,5 et hoc) ETHOC B, i.e. ἤθος.

122,19 TAM) So BC. TUM conj. with all Dick's codices.

123,28 fabulariter) familiariter B.

125,14 NEBECUAM) mibeculam B.

125,27 CACOFATON) cacofaton BC. "cacemphaton" should be read if any correction is attempted.

126,11 TERTIE) So BC. TERTIAM conj. with all Dick's codices.

126,27 saepe) Here B adds:- enim oesa solummodo interponuntur in continua eleutions, saepe...

127,6 ab una parte orationis) A new lemma (266,10 D), beginning a new sentence.

127,14 & 15 Velatam) velatam.

128,18 dereliquit) So BC. dereliquerit conj.

- 128,20 EFFITIANTUR) So BC. INFITIANTUR conj. with all Dick's codices.
- 128,21 proverbium) So BC. proverbia conj.
- 128,29 initio) in initio B.
- 128,29 septem) So BC. sunt septem conj.
- 129,1 quo secutus est) So BC. quibus subsidiis conj.
- 129,6 Si animal....diffiniuntur) So BC. The passage seems corrupt, but
I see no plausible correction
- 130,13 velut) vel ut.
- 131,16 ab his) So BC. a bis conj.
- 131,22 duplicato numere) So BC. duplicato quinque numere conj.
- 132,1 more mentis) incrementa B. The reading of C appears to be
"incrementi".
- 132,2 aetas) aetatis B.
- 132,9 sit) fit BC.
- 132,19 nec gignitur) So BC. nec gignit nec gignitur conj.
- 132,22 et enim) etenim.
- 132,25 per Venerem) parvenitur B.
- 132,25 decursum) So BC. A verb such as "dicitur" or "percurritur" seems
to have fallen out.
- 133,9 νύμφας) The manuscript reading "limfas" is sound.
- 133,12 VOLUCRE) So BC. VOLUCREM conj. with all Dick's codices.
- 133,17 Punctuate thus:-....Latinos. Per antifrasin ergo dicitur noctivida
glauca....etc.
- 133,19 eo) eo quod B.

133,23 Ops cultrix) Thus BC. auscultatrix conj. Clius Ops ^tcultas†)

cluis obscultas B. cluis auscultas conj. Cf. supr. 5,33.

133,26 ἄθανάτης) ATANAΘE BC. ἄθανάτη conj.

133,26 θάνατος) ΘANE BC. θανεῖν conj. Cf. 167,1 fage.

133,29 omnibus) hominibus B.

terre^{re}) So BC. HORRERE conj. (lemma, 286,10 D).

133,31 quondam) A new sentence begins here.

133,33 moveri) So BC. mitari conj.

134,8 matrem) matrum B.

135,5 procerum...proceri) Comment is superfluous.

135,14 non) nunc B.

135,21 superba) A lemma-word (288,5 D).

135,26 dicunt) dicit BC.

136,14 acria) aera BC. I see no merit in the emendation.

136,26 formatur) format B. The reading of C is obscure in my photostat:

it can only be format or formatus.

136,29 dicunt) dicit BC.

137,3 aspiratione) asrespiratione B. respirations conj.

137,6 absconderet) absconderetur B.

137,10 NON NULIAS) So BC. Some words have been lost, presumably glosses on

astruere and rationes.

137,25 dicitur) Here B adds:- Italia ab stella ut diximus, altera Ispania,
quae dicitur...

138,13 XII) XV B.

138,18 demutata) mutata BC.

138,20 B punctuate thus:- Unde scierunt...ultra D stadia?

139,10 arum vel) ^{orum} cec~~erum~~ l B, 1.2. ducentorum quinquaginta.

139,13 ambitum) So BC. ambitu conj.

139,22 quodcumque) quodque BC. quod conj.

139,25 tollo ter tollitur BC.

munerat) numerat B.

139,27 orientalem) So B¹C. orientem B².

139,29 vel) om. B.

139,30 non) nam B.

140,3 quo) unde B.

140,18 γῖγνωσκω) ΓΝΩ BC, which should be kept.

GNOMEN) Gnomon BC.

141,1 diximus hoc vel ita dicit hoc) So BC. Some confused recording of a variant reading seems to underly this corruption. The sense may be served well enough by reading simply hoc est.

141,10 pro partium ratione) A lemma (296,9 D). The entire gloss has been displaced, and has no business where Dr. Lutz prints it.

141,33 signiferi) So BC. <signa> signiferi conj.

143,19 descendantem) descendent in BC. descendens in conj.

143,27 dixit) After this word B inserts licet.

grandiores) So BC. grandes Rand.

144,1 antipodes illorum) A new sentence, and a new lemma (299,22 Disk).

144,3 meridian) So BC. meridiem conj.

144,17 Punctuate thus:- sicuti nos; quando occidit, in orientem; etc.

144,19 quia) qui a B.

144,29 transierint) transient B (transierit C).

145,1 Romani) So BC. A lemma Romanorum dimensione has fallen out.

145,7 culmen) So BC. fulmen conj.

145,23 His adicitur) Nisa dicitur B. nisos (i.e. $\nu\eta\sigma\omicron\varsigma$) dicitur conj.

Nevertheless it is possible that John thinks that the noun belongs to the first declension, and that the reading of B is sound.

145,28 miliarium) Here B inserts:- usque ad unum. Vel sic -

contrahitur ultra secundum milliarium...Then follows:- ut non perveniat etc. The words have been omitted by an oversight by the scribe of C.

146,12 PROPTER quantum) So BC. propter eantum conj. Dr. Lutz was unable to find the "lemma".

146,11 Syrenaei) Syrenae BC. Syrenes conj. (cf. sup. 55,24).

146,17 valle) vallem B.

146,18 et) en B.

146,26 velut) vel ut.

147,8 sunt) fiunt B.

148,6 NIXTON μικτόν) Nixon nixton BC. $\mu\kappa\epsilon\acute{\nu}\nu$ mixtum conj.

148,12 After contrario some words have been lost from both manuscripts.

I suggest:- dissentiens in angulis, consentiens in lateribus.

148,19 Αποδεικτικά) ΑΠΟΔΙΚΤΙΚΙ B. apodictici or should be read.

148,25 disputatio) dispositio B. lemma (358,4 D).

149,15 linea) una linea B. lineae conj.

149,23 MIKTH) The correction cannot be justified. MIKTON BC and several of Dick's codices.

150,9 totam) So BC. totum conj.

150,22 poeta) poecio C. poetio B. Boetio conj. The reference is of course to De Arithmetica 11,24.

150,29 quae ternario) quaternario.

150,30 aliter) alter B.

etsi aequalibus) ET SI AEQUALIBUS (lemma, 362,4 D).

151,1 tolle VI, duo remanetⁿ; IV) tolle de VI duo; remanent IV B.

152,22 vacillantem) macillantem C, macilentem B. macilentam conj.

153,4 id esset) id est esset B.

153,13 exeret) So BC. exeret all Dick's codices.

153,19 placeatur) So BC. placetur conj.

153,27 lascivis) So BC. oculis conj.

154,1 nubibus) nuntibus B.

154,20 cometi) commoti B.

154,28 CLIMATE) climate B. colliniatae should be restored from all Dick's codices. The corruption is very easy to understand.

154,30 MIRACULIS....denario) So BC. The text is corrupt, but I see no way to restore it.

155,24 QUAE) qua C. quasi B, which must be read.

156,5 corpulentia) So BC. corpulentiae conj.

156,20 dicitur) Here B inserts:- quia a nullo (nulla cod.) cerné potest per se, atque ideo opinabilis dicitur).

157,1 implecitur) implectur C, impletur B.

158,2 sive cum suo genere) A new lemma (370,6 D).

158,5 quia a caelo) qui a caelo C. quia caelum B.

158,31 sit) fit BC.

159,5 lumine) A new lemma (373,9 D; see Dick's apparatus).

159,8 bis Sextilis) Quid dicam nescio; sed an vidisti Intinae Appendicem?

sit ut) sicut B^2 .

159,17 sides bivos) So BC. For the emendation of this passage I am indebted to Mr. E.W. Handley of University College, who restores cidos bebecn from Fulgentius, Myth. III,5 (p.65,11 Helm).

160,6 impar progressus) It should be made clear that these words belong to Martianus.

160,11 et dici possunt ceteri) et dici possint ceteri BC^2 , e.d. possunt c.
 C^1 . A new lemma (379,10 D).

160,19 et) om. B

160,27 sed potest) So BC. sed omnis potest conj.

161,5 perfectio) perfecto B.

161,23 quia ratio) So BC. quia eandem ratio conj.

161,26 MAIOR...procedit) All a lemma. John means that multiplies is to be taken as translating $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\alpha\pi\lambda\alpha\iota\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma$ etc.

162,8 inter duos fines) Lemma (394,6 D).

162,10 quam duo ad unum) Part of the lemma.

162,11 omnes) os BC.

162,29 qui) quia B.

162,31 sicut) sic ut B (the two words separated by a point).

162,32 nascetur) So BC. nascatur conj.

163,3 habet) So BC. habetur conj.

163,8 ratione) rationem B.

163,15 parium numerorum multitudo) Lemma (396,20 D). All Dick's codices have 'par numerorum multitudo.' Perhaps we should read in Martian par parium numerorum multitudo.

163,23 supersit) So BC. superest conj.

ex contrario) A new sentence begins here.

163,25 resolvi) resolvi.

164,10 novenarius) novenarius et duodenarius B.

164,19 et quasi monas) et om. B.

164,21 uno) So BC. Perhaps we should read et unum; but in any case John is writing nonsense in a desperate attempt to explain a corrupt text.

165,3 naturaliter) So BC. naturalis conj. Cf. Isidore, Origines III,27,1.

165,4 cogitantur) So BC. cogitatur conj.

165,31 euhans) euna BC. evoc conj., if any correction be needed. Once again I am unable to follow the mental processes of Dr. Lutz.

166,1 vie iectus) vi electus.

- 167,5 The manuscript reading Entellus is sound.
- 167,7 Punctuate thus:- Satyri per utres. Ideo...etc.
- 167,11 CENSURA) So BC. <SUB> CENSURA conj.
- 167,13 AD) So BC. The spelling at is better, for clearness' sake.
- 167,20 iuvas) vivas BC.
- 167,23 Negate) nega te. See Quintilian 1, 5, 36.
- 167,31 KAI KAIPON) KAI et, AIPON B. See Dick's apparatus.
- 168,25 D octo) ^{dec} B, i.e. septingenta.
- 169,7 dicat) dicit B.
- 169,16 valde deridebas) So BC. valde ridebas conj.
- 169,25 cognoscite) recognosce te B, cognosce te C. Dr. Ints manufactures another solecism.
- 170,4 FEXTALIS) So C. The word is unknown to Forcellini. fatalis B and all Dick's codices.
- 170,8 ASTRAEAN TEMINQUE) The manuscript reading Astriantemque must be retained.
- 170,28 Scopas) scopas.
- 170,29 PALLIOLOS....tegender) Palliolos, subauditur per. Non tegenda, i.e. nonne tegenda B.
- 171,11 lenitatem) levitatem B.
- 171,31 diversitates) So BC. diversitate conj.
- 172,6 permittit) dimittit BC, a permissible usage in the ninth century.
- 172,20 FERINE) So BC. FERENIA conj.

- 172,30 pro origine) pro eregione, the reading of B and C, occurs again on p.184,30, but I can find no other parallel. Perhaps we should simply read pro regione in both places.
- 173,2 aut) So BC. autem conj.
- 173,3 detrorsum) dextrorsum B.
- 173,20 inter se) Lemma (434,3 D).
- 173,26 aut finditur) Part of the lemma.
- 174,2 more geometrico) Lemma (435,7 D).
- 174,14 ENFONACI] ENFONACIC B and all Dick's codices.
- 174,14 septentrionalis) So BC. septentrionali conj.
- 174,20 φωνέω) There is no ground for rejecting the manuscript reading.
- 174,26 quia) quia a B.
- 174,30 CLUIT vel) em. B. There is no trace in Dick's apparatus of such a variant in Martian, and the words should accordingly be struck out.
- 175,1 Cratera) Statera B.
- 176,2 INTERIACTENTIS) Dr. Lutz has again enriched the Latin language. inlaecentis BC. Read interiacentis with all Dick's codices.
- 176,31 signiferi) signi signiferi BC.
- 178,8 veniat) So BC. veniet conj.
- 178,11 quibus) So BC. quibusdam conj. A full stop should follow die.
- 179,13 cylindrium) cylindricum B. Perhaps a new formation of John's own, representing κυλινδροειδής turbonidum is analogous, but a hybrid.

- 179,11 id est et cornu unum) So BC. There is no sense to be got from the words. Perhaps we should read:- id est <in modum metae. Meta> et cornu unum: unum here being used in the sense of idem.
- 179,14 cylindris) cylindridis BC. John seems to decline the word cylindris, cylindridis.
- 179,17 summitate) So BC. summitatem conj.
- 180,2 <TER>) Dr. Lutz' conjecture is confirmed by B.
- 180,9 A full stop must be set after appareat.
- 180,13 est et) esset B.
- 180,24 lunaria) lunaris BC.
- 180,26 Punctuate thus: q. v. p. est luna nobis, contra solem... etc.
- 180,30 non) So BC. Delete.
- 180,31 <et> flexibiliores <sunt>) The additions should not be made. flexiliores (BC) should be kept.
- 180,32 nobis) So BC. sole conj.
- sol) terra BC, which should be kept. But in any case John is writing nonsense.
- 180,34 CONTIGERIT) So BC. COMPREHENDERIT: contigerit conj.
- 180,35 videtur) So BC. videatur conj.
- occasum) So BC. occasu conj.
- 181,1 primave) So BC. primaque conj. CF. Plin. N.H.11,17.
- 181,4 videatur) So BC. videtur conj.
- Prima) qm. B.
- 181,5 currit) So BC. currat conj.

181,5 *mediam*) So BC. *dimidiam* conj., although mediam might conceivably be defended.

apparet) So BC. *appareat* conj.

181,7 *apparet*) So BC. *appareat* conj. (The whole passage should read as follows: *nam si contigerit ut in coitu sit mane et appareat vespere prima, minor videtur: si vero contigerit ut in media nocte accendatur et postea currat per dimidiam noctem et totam diem usque ad occasum et tunc appareat, maior. Si vero vespere contigerit, et in alia vespere appareat prima, maxima.*

181,8 ΜΗΝΟΕΙΔΗC) *monoides* BC, which must be retained.

181,11 ἀμφί *circa* <ΑΜΦΙΚΥΡΤΟC>] *amficirca* B. In no ms. is the word written in Greek characters, if Dick's report is correct.

181,12 VIII) *octava* B.

181,10 The lemma is to be found in Dick's β'AMRB' , if Dr. Lutz had taken the trouble to look for it.

181,28 *solis*) Dr. Lutz' emendation is less than fair to John's astronomy. *suus* B.

182,2 XXXII) The manuscript reading XXXIIB; (*triginta duabus*) is sound.

182,19 *momentis*) Lemma (457,8 D).

182,26 XII) XII B (i.e. ^{is} *duodecimis*).

183,16 ANABIBAZONTA) John could not foresee the emendation of Salmassius. *ANABIBAZON* BC and all Dick's codices.

183,22 CONTRARIUS) *contrariis* B.

183,23 PARTIQUE) *parti* B.

184,22 *reddunt*) The manuscript reading is sound.

184,28 elongatus) So BC. elongatur conj.

186,19 irrata) irata BC, not irita as Dr. Intz reports it. I cannot understand the emendation.

186,20 acumen) So BC. acumine conj.

187,8 tantum) Lemma (471,8 D).

188,3 Philologia) So BC. Philologiae conj.

188,28 divinet) So BC. divinat conj.

cortina) Lemma (474,1 D).

189,2 manifestat) So BC. manifestet conj.

190,18 AUT...pignerit) So BC. There has been some dislocation, which cannot be corrected with certainty.

190,27 MORTALITAS modulatione) mortalitas in modulatione B. The words must be joined to the preceding sentence.

191,5 indocturus) introducturus B.

191,26 sensus. Delectatio) sensus delectatio.

192,3 Dioncen) Diancen BC. I do not understand the emendation Dioncen must be read.

PRIME) So BC. Read PONE with all Dick's codices.

192,23 FLEXANIMUM) flexanimum BC, which should be kept. See Dick's apparatus.

193,4 qua si) quas BC.

193,10 ante) cantu B.

193,23 circularis) So BC. circulans conj.

194,6 antistans) antestans BC, which should be kept. Perhaps one should write ante stans.

194,16 SUBLIMES) So BC. ^{Read} sublimis with all Dick's codices.

194,26-27 Punctuate thus:clypeum. Ab illo loco... reliqua,
musicam etc.

195,6 effigies. FORMULAS PARVAS) Dr. Lutz confounds lemma and gloss.

EFFIGIES: formulas parvas.

195,12 illa) Lemma (483,8 D).

est) So BC. id est conj.

195,29 sacra) sancta BC.

recursio) Lemma (483,19 D).

196,4 rotatur) pro rotatur B.

196,10 vel aurorae) em. B.

ether rorae) et horore B. horore is perhaps a bad spelling for
aurorae, and vel aurorae is a scribe's gloss. But the corruption
lies deeper than this. I can suggest no plausible emendation.

196,16 PLAUSTRIUGA) So BC. PLAUSTRIUGAS should be read with most of
Dick's codices.

LUMINET) So BC. luminat all Dick's codices.

196,21 inseritur) So BC. INDITUR: inseritur conj.

196,24 noccebant) Mistakenly repeated from the previous gloss. It seems
likely that siderum has fallen out.

197,4 COLLIGENS) So BC. colligans all Dick's codices.

197,6 detinentur) So BC. detineantur conj.

197,7 Musa) So BC. Musae conj.

197,9 movit) So BC. mutat conj.

197,12 quae) quaeso B. (Lemma, 485,3 D). The lemma and gloss have been mistakenly repeated.

197,24 MULCET) permulcet BC.

198,7 φοιτῶντος) phoetontis BC, which should be kept: a bad spelling of Phaethontis.

198,13 CONTRAHUNT, id est vertunt) So BC. CONTRAHANT, i.e. vertant conj., with all Dick's codices.

198,19 PRODIANT) So BC. prodient all Dick's codices.

198,26 movit) So BC. mutat conj.

199,8 inardens) ardens B.

200,3 negat) So BC. Mistakenly repeated from the line above. The original gloss has been lost.

200,11 inductus) induptus B.

201,27 EXOSAE) exosa B.

202,32 unam) qm. B.

204,20 turba) Part of the lemma: see Dick's apparatus. For vel we should probably read id est.

205,14 in modum) So BC. modum conj.

206,2 Punctuate thus: arithmetica. Legitima...etc.

206,5 TETARTEMORIAE) So BC. tetartemorria all Dick's codices.

206,9 per hanc) Lemma (494,22 D).

206,10 ab illa) Lemma (494,22 D).

206,15 ac dimidium tertias) Part of the lemma (495,2 D).

206,31 <e> The addition is unnecessary.

207,13 semitorii, id est) semitorii B.

207,14 tetracorda quina) A new lemma (499,1 D).

207,20 EXURSE) So BC. EX SURSE conj.

208,31 tres) Part of the lemma.

209,1 erit tertia) Lemma (503,18 D).

209,3 et παραγῆτη) Part of the lemma (503,18 D).

209,9 unam) id est B.

209,11 GENERI) ceteri B.

209,13 intermeson) inter meson.

210,3 uno) So BC. uni conj.

aut plurimis) Lemma (506,7 D).

colliguntur) colligitur BC.

210,6 diastema) inter diastema B.

210,16 INCOMPOSITO) incomposita BC.

210,27 binarius....dividit) per binarium dividitur BC.

210,29 diapason) diadiapason B.

210,30 XIII) Here B adds:- ac duo, i.e. XII. duplicata, i.e. XIII.

The lemmata are from 509,1 D. For ac duo we must of course read
X ac duo.

211,2 QUARTA PARTICULATIONE) QUARTAPARTICULATIONE.

211,8 The lemma comes from 510,12 D. incomposita is another lemma from
the same line.

211,14 per) qm B.

211,21 tritemoria) So BC. tritemoriam conj.

- 211,29 ut a media in παραμέσῃν) Lemma (512,8 D). The gloss seems to have been lost. Remigius (PL 131,945D) has after paramesen the note "i.e. in illam quae est prope mediam".
- 212,8 sed per tones) id est tones B. Remigius:- "non per senos, id est non per tones, sed per hemitonia."
- 213,1 tractum) tactum BC.
- 213,28 DIATONUS) diatenuus BC. EATENUS conj.
- 214,12 cantantur) So BC. cantatur conj.
- 214,26 per contrarium) Lemma (520,17 D).
prolixius tempus) Lemma (520,15 D).
- 215,6 et hoc est quod dicit) After this formula the next lemma should of course follow without a break.
- 216,21 quattuor) So BC. quattuor <brevia> conj.
- 217,3 ACCOMPOSITI) So BC. INCOMPOSITI AC COMPOSITI conj.
- 217,12 varianter) variantur BC. Dr. Lutz' mark of exclamation should be reserved for her own incompetence.
- 217,27 ἱαμβιάζω) iambizi BC. ἱαμβίζειν conj.
- 217,29 inviolatas) A palmary emendation. invidias B.
- 218,1 qui) So BC. quia conj.
- 218,2 existimatur) existim^eatur B.
- 218,3 semanticis) semanticus B². Even with this improvement the entire note seems to me defective in grammar and sense.
- 218,10 triplicem proportionem) So BC. DUPLICEM PROPORTIONEM conj. CF. 529,14D.
- 218,15 ET LONGA) ex longa BC. EX LONGA POSITIONE conj.
longa elatione) Lemma (529,14 D).

219,25 accipitur) So BC. accipiat conj.

219,26 amphiacri) amphiacerus B.

219,28 \ Melopoe > ia) Dr. Lutz fills the hiatus against the sense.

rithmica B.

220,2 Dr. Lutz' conjecture is confirmed by B.

Appendix 2. Some suggested emendations in C.E. Lutz' Text of the
Commentary of "Dunchad" upon Martianus Capella.

- 1,22 eandem) quandam conj.
- 2,26 infimam) infimi conj.
- 2,30 terrentur) torrentur conj.
malae) male conj.
- 2,34 ὑποδύν) position cod., which should be kept.
- 3,13 IAM SEDE etc.) These words should follow "praecipio" without a break.
- 3,21 Punctuato thus: quattuor elementorum duo etc.
- 4,8 in eo) Part of the lemma, i.e. IN EOSISTRA.
- 4,8 indumenti) In a sane author the conjecture instrumenti would be quite probable, but with "Dunchad" one cannot be certain.
- 4,14 cum omnia dicit corpora) These words cannot be right. I suggest omnia mundi corpora. maxime gives no sense: the planets do not give out sounds "particularly when they are motion", since they are never at rest. Perhaps maximo. For comparison I give the corresponding passage in Remigius. "Ergo lunae tympana Cybeleia dicit, quia, cum omnia elementa mundi in motu sint et musicam de se efficient, sola terra, quae in statu est, nullum de se sonum emittit, utitur tamen proximo sono lunari."
- 4,36 amphicirca) amphicirca conj. Thus also in 1.37
- 5,20 finguntur) figuntur conj. This correction is supported by the manuscripts of Remigius.

- 5,29 Punctuate thus:- ... vilescit, quod ... colorem: in fine ad mortem ducit.
- 5,31 significatur) There is no valid objection to the manuscript reading signatur.
- 5,35 id est petasum, vel os) The words should be struck out as a mistaken repetition from line 34.
- 6,2-3 ubi iste ... cum serpentibus) I can make nothing of this sentence, and the comments of Remigius throw no light upon it. Viderint peritiores.
- 6,25 SED TUNC ... paterstur) I cannot locate the lemma.
- 6,31 lunare) solare conj.
- 8,28 dissonant iam sacra) dissonantia sacra conj.
- 9,22 EXAUDITA) It is strange that no such reading should be found in any of Dick's codices. Remigius explains audita as exaudita, from which I suspect that "AUDITA: exaudita" should be restored here.
- 10,34 cumque) tuncque conj.
- 11,8 splendidus) splendidum conj.
- 11,27 insensibilem) sensibilem conj.
- 11,35 ΑΠΑΞ) 'Α ΑΠΑΞ conj. ΑΠΑΞ cod.
ET) KAI conj.
ΕΤΕΚΕΙΝΑ) The ms. reading should be kept.
- 16,21 nil longius) Delete.

- 16,33 ficto) A singular invention. non cito coq.
- 18,4 divae) divinae. I had rather condemn the error of the scribe than support the manuscript lection out of Prudentius.
- 18,9 Attica) in Attica conj.
- 19,28 indiscendis) i.e. discendis conj.
- 23,12 ot) Delete.
- 25,24 ideo quia) These words begin a new sentence, replying to the question "Queritur quare etc."
- 25,29 nomen) nomine conj.
- 25,30 pontus) Part of the quotation.
- 25,31 et est) A new sentence begins here.
- 25,32 Si partem ...) This is of course not a new sentence, but a dependent clause governed by "est sinecdoche quae ad totum ^tper_hinet".
- 27,6 bipedale) A lemma (167,15 D). QUANTITAS should be deleted.
- 27,9-11 Omnia accidentia ... qualitas et quantitas) I can make nothing of this. The most corrupt words seem to be "aucta res", but I can suggest no emendation.
- 27,31 immutatoria) Velim quis mihi hac arte Lutziam in hominem immutet. Obviously imitatoria must be restored from line 35.
- 30,7-9 Quae loca ... manifestum est) There is no sense to be got out of these words. Dr. Lutz' emendation loca is obviously wrong. The general sense required is "quae locis carere, quibus corpora terminantur, sua tamen loca, quibus res incorporeales terminantur, habere manifestum est."

- 31,15 The punctuation almost rivals the felicity of "philosophi Graecorum locorum". Punctuate thus:- ..manere: sola vero corpora ita accidens etc
- 32,15 vel negari) The words are obviously misplaced. I suggest in line 13 quas affirmare vel negare nemo potest. The general meaning of the paragraph may be understood from Augustine, Princ. Dial. c.4, which "Dunchad" is clumsily paraphrasing.
- 32,20 <ut>) The addition is unnecessary.
- 33,31 <locubus>) The addition is quite wrong. Augustinus is taken as an example of an entity distinguished from others by various attributes falling under the several categories. Doubtless he is thinking of the stock example:- Augustinus orator magnus filius illius, stans in templo hodie infulatus disputando fatigetur.
- 36,1 servit) servit.
- 37,5 IUSSAE) The missing lemma (see app. crit.) is found in five of Dick's manuscripts.
- 37,7 pretio) A lemma-word.
- 42,27 recinaculis) retinaculis conj. The reading of the manuscript might be either.
- 42,31 <in quo>) An absurd emendation. The explanation runs along these lines:- AN ALIUD scilicet quam thesis, infinita quaestio, SUCCURRIT ... etc.
- 44,11 causam agentis aliorum) In the deliberative style of speaking a man is not said "agere causam". Perhaps we should read oratoria vel aliorum.
- 46,2 The gloss yields no sense. Perhaps we should rearrange the passage thus: ACCUSAT, scilicet eum stupratorem.